

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AND  
SENSE OF COHERENCE, SELF - EFFICACY AND LOCUS OF  
CONTROL IN A UTILITY ORGANISATION**

by

Alyson Hobkirk

Hons. B.A. (Industrial Psychology)

Mini- dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Magister Artium in Industrial Psychology in the School of Behavioural Sciences at the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.

Study Leader : Dr. J.H. Buitendach

Potchefstroom

January 2003

**NORTH WEST UNIVERSITY  
VAAL TRIANGLE CAMPUS**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the following people:

- My parents and family for their support and motivation.
- Eric, for your love and belief in me.
- Dr. Buitendach for her guidance.
- The Statistical Consultation Services, with specific reference to Aldine Oosthuizen, in the statistical analysis of the data and advice.
- Stan Green for allowing me to use a sample of Managers and Supervisors within the organisation
- All the participants in the organisation who participated in this study
- My Heavenly Father for providing me with the ability and inspiration.

## **NOTICE**

The text citations and reference list in this mini-dissertation, are done in accordance with the regulations set down by the American Psychological Association (1994) in their Publication Manual (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). This is done in accordance with the policy followed by the program in Industrial Psychology at the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.

## **ABSTRACT**

**Title:** The relationship between leadership styles and sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control.

**Keywords:** Sense of coherence, self - efficacy, locus of control, transactional leadership, transformational leadership

Developing and retaining leadership is one of the greatest challenges facing organisations today. Leaders operate in an increasingly demanding and ever-changing work environment on both a personal and organisational level. To be successful on both levels leaders require the correct competencies, behaviours and skills to achieve their business objectives. Aside from leadership behaviours, specific leadership styles, demographic variables and constructs such as sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control have a direct effect on the associated leadership style. These styles may either be effective or ineffective and have a direct impact on the demonstrated leadership within the organisation.

The concept of leadership styles in this study relates to supervisors, managers and leaders, within the organisation and includes aspects of leadership, such as transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles.

The objective of this study, was to determine the possible relationship between leadership styles and the three psychological strengths, namely sense of coherence, locus of control and generalised self - efficacy. A cross-sectional survey design was used. The sample consisted of 216 supervisors, managers and leaders in a utility organisation. A representative sample of ethnic groups, language and gender groups were selected to make the study as representative as possible. Four questionnaires were administered, namely the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), the Orientation to Life Questionnaire (OLQ), the Generalised Perceived Self-efficacy Scale (GSES) and the Work Locus of Control Scale (LOC).

In the study, sense of coherence is conceptualised as a disposition that allows a person to select appropriate strategies to cope with stressors. Individuals with a strong sense of coherence, will experience information from their environment, which falls within their

subjective spheres of interest, as comprehensible, manageable and meaningful. Generalised self - efficacy is conceptualised as a general, stable trait, which is related to individuals' beliefs regarding the ability to mobilise their motivation, cognitive resources and actions to comply with demands by a situation. The locus of control concept refers to individuals' beliefs regarding their behaviour and the outcomes thereof. Similarly, individuals with an internal locus of control, believe that outcomes in their lives are the result of their own internal attributes, whereas individuals with an external locus of control believe that outcomes in their lives are beyond their control.

Cronbach alpha coefficients and factor analysis were used to determine the reliability and validity of the tests. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis) were used in the compiling of the profile of characteristics of gender and leadership styles as manifested in the group, while second-order factor analysis was used to look at the nature of the situational characteristics of leadership styles.

Empirical findings in the study indicated that supervisors and managers perceived their own leadership styles as being more transformational than transactional. Possible reasons for this perception included the questionnaire being a self-assessment of individual styles as opposed to an objective multi-rater evaluation by peers and colleagues. The implications of this perception are quite significant in that the actual behaviour being observed and demonstrated within the organisation is more transactional. In addition, there was significant evidence of a substantial level of non-leadership being displayed in the study. Findings indicated that tenure significantly affected the type of leadership style perceived. This was made evident in that leaders who were employed for five years and less being more transformational in their leadership style than those employed for ten years and more, being more transactional and even being non-leaders (*laissez-faire*).

In addition, supervisors and managers in the study expressed high levels of sense of coherence, which suggested that they experienced life events as manageable and viewed them as challenges. Regarding levels of self-efficacy, a significant relationship was found between self-efficacy and leadership; as the more transformational the perceived leadership style, the higher the level of self-efficacy. Furthermore, educated managers experienced lower levels of self-efficacy than those managers who had a technical qualification, which empowered them with easily transferable skills in the workplace. A significant relationship was also found

between locus of control and non-leadership, which suggested that managers experienced significant levels of external locus of control. This implies that managers perceive the results of their actions due to forces beyond their control. The result of which results in stress, absenteeism and job dissatisfaction.

Recommendations for further research were made, as well as recommendations in regard of the company concerned.

## OPSOMMING

**Titel:** Die verband tussen leierskapstyle en koherensiebewustheid, selfdoeltreffendheid en die lokus van beheer.

**Sleutelwoorde:** leierskap, koherensiebewustheid, selfdoeltreffendheid, lokus van beheer

Die ontwikkeling en die instandhouding van leierskap is een van die vernaamste uitdagings waarmee organisasies vandag te kampe het. In 'n toenemend veeleisende en steeds veranderende omgewing moet leiers die fort hou op sowel persoonlike as organisatoriese vlak. Ten einde albei uitdagings die hoof te bied, moet hulle bekwaam wees, oor die nodige vaardighede beskik en bepaalde gedragpatrone openbaar. Afgesien van leierseienskappe, beïnvloed bepaalde leierskapstyle, demografiese veranderlikes en konstruksies soos die vlak van koherensie, selfdoeltreffendheid en die lokus van beheer die ooreenstemmende leierskapstyl regstreeks. Hierdie style mag soms wel doeltreffend wees, maar het altyd 'n regstreeks aantoonbare impak op die leierskap binne die organisasie.

In hierdie studie is die begrip "leierskapstyl" van toepassing op toesighouers, bestuurders en leiers binne die organisasie en omvat dit ook aspekte van leierskap soos transaksionele, transformasionele en *laissez-faire* leierskapstyle.

Die doel van hierdie studie is om die waarskynlike verband te bepaal tussen leierskapstyle en die drie psigologiese kragpunte, te wete koherensiebewustheid, lokus van beheer en algemene selfdoeltreffendheid. Daar is gebruik gemaak van die beginsel van deursnee-opnames. Die steekproef het uit 216 toesighouers, bestuurders en leiers in 'n nutsmaatskappy bestaan. 'n Verteenwoordigende monster, bestaande uit die verskillende etniese, taal- en geslagsgroepe, is saamgestel. Vier vraelysondersoeke is geloods; die Multifaktor-Leierskapsvraelys (MLV), die Lewensoriëntasie-vraelys (LOV), die Skaal van Veralgemeende Waargenome Probaatheid (SVWP) en die Skaal van Werkslokusbeheer (SLB).

In hierdie studie is koherensiebewustheid gekonsepsualiseer as 'n ingesteldheid waarvolgens iemand 'n toepaslike strategie kies om stres te bowe te kom. Individue met 'n sterk ontwikkelde sin van koherensiebewustheid sal bewus reageer op omgewingsimpulse wat verband hou met subjektiewe sfere wat hulle belangrik ag, en hulle sal dit as bevatlik,

beheerbaar en betekenisvol ervaar. Onder veralgemeende selfdoeltreffendheid word 'n algemeen stabiele karaktertrek verstaan wat verband hou met die individuele siening betreffende die vermoë om sy motivering, kognitiewe vermoëns en optrede in beweging te stel ten einde te voldoen aan die eise van 'n gegewe situasie. Die begrip "lokus van beheer" verwys na die vermoë van individue om peil te trek op hul eie gedrag en die gevolge daarvan. Op soortgelyke manier glo individue met 'n sterk ontwikkelde interne sin van lokusbeheer dat hulle self in beheer is van hul dade en die vrugte daarvan. Hierteenoor glo individue met 'n eksterne lokus van beheer dat die gevolge van hul dade nie deur hulself bepaal word nie.

Crombach-alfakoëffisiënte en faktoranalises is aangewend om die betroubaarheid en geldigheid van die toetse te bepaal. Daar is gebruik gemaak van deskriptiewe statistiek (gemiddeldes, standaardafwykinge, skeefheid en kurtosis) in die samestelling van eienskapsprofile ten opsigte van gender/geslag- en leierskapstyle soos dit in die groep na vore kom, terwyl 'n tweede-ordefaktoranalise aangewend is om die aard van situasionele leierskapseienskappe te bepaal.

Empiriese bevindinge op grond van hierdie studie toon aan dat toesighouers en bestuurders hul eie leierskapstyle as meer transformasioneel, eerder as transaksioneel, van aard beskou. Moontlike verklarings hiervoor setel stellig daarin dat die vraelys gerig was op selfbeoordeling eerder as op objektiewe multiskalige portuurbeoordeling. Die implikasies hiervan is veelbetekenend in dié opsig dat die waargenome optrede, soos dit in die organisasies na vore gekom het, meer transaksioneel van aard was. Voorts is daar genoegsame gronde om 'n beduidende vlak van nie-leierskap te poneer. Volgens die bevindinge het ampstatus ook 'n beduidende invloed gehad op die tipe leierskap wat geopenbaar is. Dit blyk daaruit dat leiers met dienstermyne van vyf jaar of korter meer transformasionele gedrag geopenbaar het as leiers met tien of meer jaar diens, wat veel meer transaksioneel ingestel was en hul selfs as nie-leiers (*laissez-faire*) voorgedoen het.

Voorts het toesighouers en bestuurders hoë vlakke van koherensiebewustheid geopenbaar; dit suggereer dat hulle die lewensmas opkom en dit selfs as uitdagend ervaar. Wat vlakke van probaatheid betref, is bevind dat daar 'n beduidende verband tussen selfdoeltreffendheid en leierskap as sodanig bestaan. Hoog opgeleide bestuurders het laer vlakke van selfdoeltreffendheid geopenbaar as diegene met 'n tegniese kwalifikasie.

'n Beduidende verband bestaan kennelik ook tussen die lokus van beheer en nie-leierskap, wat impliseer dat bestuurders grootliks vatbaar was vir eksterne lokus van beheer. Dit dui daarop dat bestuurders die gevolge van hul optrede beoordeel as buite hul eie beheer. Dit gee regstreeks aanleiding tot stres, afwesigheid en 'n gebrek aan werksbevrediging.

Aanbevelinge vir verdere navorsing, asook vir die onderhawige firma, word in die studie gemaak.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
NOTICE.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
OPSOMMING.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xix

## **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION, PROBLEM STATEMENT, RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY**

1.1	INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.2	PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	2
1.3	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	8
1.3.1	General Objectives.....	8
1.3.2	Specific Objectives.....	8
1.4	RESEARCH METHOD.....	9
1.4.1	Literature Review.....	9
1.4.2	Empirical study.....	9
1.4.2.1	Research Design.....	9
1.4.2.2	Study Population.....	10
1.4.2.3	Measuring instruments.....	10
1.4.2.4	Research Procedure.....	12
1.4.2.5	Statistical Analysis.....	12
1.5	CHAPTER DIVISION.....	13

1.6	CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	13
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>		
2.1	INTRODUCTION.....	14
2.2	CONCEPTUALISING LEADERSHIP THEORIES.....	14
2.3	THE HISTORY AND ORIGIN OF LEADERSHIP ACCORDING TO THEORETICAL APPROACHES	17
2.3.1	The Trait or Great Man theories.....	17
2.3.2	The Personal or Behavioural theories.....	20
2.3.2.1	The Ohio State Studies.....	20
2.3.2.2	The Michigan State studies.....	21
2.3.3	The Managerial Grid theories.....	22
2.3.4	The Situational Contingency Model theories.....	22
2.3.5	Cognitive Resource theory.....	24
2.3.6	The Situational Model theory.....	24
2.3.7	Leader-Member Exchange theory.....	25
2.3.8	The Path-Goal theories.....	26
2.3.9	Leader Participation Model.....	28
2.3.10	Neocharismatic Theories.....	28
2.3.11	Charismatic Leadership.....	29
2.3.12	The Emergence of the 'New Paradigm' Model.....	29
2.4	MEASURING TRANSFORMATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP.....	35
2.5	DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF GENDER.....	35
2.6	THE SALUTOGENIC AND FORTIGENIC PARADIGM.....	37

2.6.1	Conceptualisation of Sense of coherence, self - efficacy and work locus of control.....	38
2.6.2	Sense of coherence.....	38
2.6.2.1	Conceptualising Sense of Coherence.....	39
2.6.2.2	Research Results on sense of coherence.....	40
2.7	GENERALISED SELF – EFFICACY.....	41
2.7.1	Conceptualising self – efficacy.....	41
2.7.2	The core dimensions of self – efficacy.....	42
2.7.3	The development of self – efficacy beliefs.....	42
2.7.4	The behavioural implications of self – efficacy.....	43
2.7.5	Research results on self – efficacy.....	44
2.7.6	Self - efficacy and Leadership styles.....	46
2.8	LOCUS OF CONTROL.....	48
2.8.1	The Attribution theory.....	48
2.8.2	The Social Learning theory.....	48
2.8.3	Conceptualising the locus of control.....	49
2.8.4	Research Results on the Locus of Control.....	51
2.9	THE LEADERSHIP SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA.....	54
2.10	CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	55

**CHAPTER 3: EMPIRICAL STUDY**

3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	56
3.2	THE OBJECTIVE OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDY.....	56
3.2.1	Empirical Objectives.....	56

3.3	RESEARCH DESIGN.....	57
3.4	STUDY POPULATION.....	57
3.5	THE MEASURING BATTERY.....	59
3.6	RESEARCH PROCEDURE.....	59
3.7	THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS.....	60
3.7.1	The Biographical Questionnaire.....	60
3.7.2	Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).....	61
3.7.3	Development and rationale for the MLQ.....	61
3.7.4	Description of the MLQ.....	61
3.7.5	Administration, scoring and interpretation of the MLQ.....	63
3.7.6	Reliability and validity of the MLQ.....	63
3.7.7	Rationale of the MLQ.....	64
3.8	ORIENTATION TO LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE (OLQ).....	64
3.8.1	Development and rationale for the OLQ.....	64
3.8.2	Description of the OLQ.....	65
3.8.3	Administration, scoring and interpretation of the OLQ.....	65
3.8.4	Reliability and validity of the OLQ.....	66
3.8.5	Rationale of the OLQ.....	67
3.9	GENERAL PERCEIVED SELF - EFFICACY QUESTIONNAIRE...	67
3.9.1	Rationale and development of the GPSES.....	67
3.9.2	Description of the GPSES.....	68
3.9.3	Administration, scoring and interpretation of the GPSES.....	68
3.9.4	Reliability and Validity of the GPSES.....	68
3.9.5	Rationale of the GPSES.....	69

3.10	WORK LOCUS CONTROL SCALE (WLCS).....	69
3.10.1	Rationale and development of the WLCS.....	69
3.10.2	Description of the WLCS.....	98
3.10.3	Reliability and validity of the WLCS.....	70
3.10.4	Rationale for using the WLCS.....	71
3.11	RESEARCH PROCEDURE.....	71
3.11.1	Preceding Arrangements.....	71
3.11.2	Administration of measuring instruments.....	71
3.11.3	Statistical Analysis.....	71
3.11.3.1	Descriptive Statistics.....	72
3.12	HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION.....	74
3.12.1	Nil Hypotheses.....	74
3.12.2	Alternative Hypotheses.....	75
3.13	CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	76

#### **CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	77
4.2	RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS.....	77
4.2.1	The Internal Consistency of the MLQ.....	77
4.2.2	The Internal Consistency of the OLQ.....	78
4.2.3	The Internal Consistency of the GPSES.....	78
4.2.4	The Internal Consistency of the WLCS.....	78
4.3	THE TYPE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES IN AN ORGANISATION..	79

4.4	THE LEVEL OF SENSE OF COHERENCE IN AN ORGANISATION.....	83
4.5	THE LEVEL OF GENERALISED SELF - EFFICACY IN AN ORGANISATION.....	85
4.6	THE LEVEL OF WORK LOCUS OF CONTROL IN AN ORGANISATION.....	86
4.7	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES, SENSE OF COHERENCE, SELF - EFFICACY AND LOCUS OF CONTROL IN AN ORGANISATION.....	87
4.7.1	Multiple regression analysis.....	89
4.7.1.1	Multiple regression analysis with regard to leadership styles and sense of coherence.....	89
4.7.1.2	Multiple regression analysis with regard to leadership styles and self – efficacy.....	89
4.7.2	Canonical analysis with regard to leadership styles and psychological strengths.....	90
4.8	CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	91
 <b>CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
5.1	CONCLUSIONS.....	92
5.1.1	Conclusions regarding the specific theoretical objectives.....	92
5.1.2	Conclusions regarding the specific empirical objectives.....	93
5.2	LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH.....	95
5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	96
5.3.1	Recommendations for the organisation.....	96
5.3.2	Recommendations for further research.....	97
5.4	CHAPTER SUMMARY.....	98
5.5	CONCLUSIONS.....	98

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	Demographic characteristics of the study population.....	58
TABLE 2	Reliability coefficient of the MLQ.....	77
TABLE 3	Reliability coefficient of the OLQ.....	78
TABLE 4	Reliability coefficient of the GPSES.....	78
TABLE 5	Reliability coefficient of the WLCS.....	79
TABLE 6	Descriptive statistics with regard to the MLQ.....	79
TABLE 7	Differences between leadership styles and tenure.....	81
TABLE 8	Differences between leadership styles and gender.....	82
TABLE 9	Differences between leadership styles.....	82
TABLE: 10	Descriptive statistics with regard to the OLQ.....	84
TABLE 11	Descriptive statistics with regard to the GPSES.....	85
TABLE 12	Differences between the self – efficacy of participants with different levels of education.....	86
TABLE 13	Descriptive statistics with regard to the WLCS.....	86
TABLE 14	Inter-correlations.....	87
TABLE 15	Canonical correlations between leadership styles and psychological strengths.....	90

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION, PROBLEM STATEMENT, RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this mini-dissertation is to investigate the relationship between leadership styles, sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control of managers within a utility company.

In this chapter an overview of the purpose of the study and a problem statement are discussed. The research objective and the research method are also conferred. Lastly, a chapter division is provided.

#### **1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

As organisations are moving towards flattening their structures, eliminating many middle-management levels and positions, the need for more flexible leadership styles, in organisations at all levels, becomes evident (House, 1971). Changes in industry and the workforce over two decades have resulted in the need for managers to become leaders that are more transformational in their behaviour and attitude and less transactional, in order for them to remain effective (Bass, 1999).

In other words, the type of 'leader' to promote productivity, performance and output is identified by Bass (1999) as that leader who encourages and empowers employees, through developing them into high-involvement members and teams, focused on quality, service, output and production.

Booyesen and Beaty (1997, p. 15) defines 'leadership' as "...the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organisations, of which they are members". These behaviours, attitudes and motivations are referred to as 'leadership styles' and comprise transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership (Howell & Avolio, 1993).

In addition to the above mentioned influencers, the impact of societal change has also placed an increased demand for more skilled and educated leaders, thus the responsibility of the leader and the leaders role has also changed within the flattening, organisational hierarchy. Teams of these professional leaders, seeing themselves as colleagues rather than in superior-subordinate positions are becoming more commonplace in business today as researched by Bass (1999).

Literature studies conceptualised in Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Model (1999) describe leadership styles as being either (i) transformational or (ii) transactional or (iii) laissez-faire also known as non-leadership. According to Burns and Leone (1997) the transformational leader is focused towards uplifting the morale, motivation and morals of their followers whereas transactional leaders cater to their followers' self-interests. In other words, leaders at any level should possess the ability to formulate an ideological vision for organisations, motivate their employees, improve performance and hence transformational leadership should be observed at all levels within an organisation in order to improve productivity (Bass & Avolio, 1999; House, 1971). The term 'transformational' therefore emphasises 'symbolic' leader behaviour, visionary and inspirational, values, displays of confidence in followers and performance beyond the call of duty. The above term refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests, through idealised influence (charisma), inspiration and intellectual stimulation. It elevates the follower's level of maturity and ideals for achievement and self-actualisation. In traditional terms, instead of exchanging goods, the leader works in close alliance with the team member to achieve a common goal. The transformational style 'transforms' employees to pursue organisational collective goals in lieu of self-interests. However, Howell & Avolio (1993) found that many transformational leaders engage in transactional behaviours yet supplement those behaviours with some elements of transformational leadership.

In studies conducted by Metcalfe and Metcalfe (2000) transactional leaders (management-by-exception), contribute less towards employee productivity, performance and satisfaction, than does contingent reward for transformational leader behaviour. In addition, as noted by Bass & Avolio (1990b), transactional leadership styles, simply do not go far enough in building the trust and developing the motivation to achieve the potential required of ones workforce. Yet coupled with *individual consideration*, they may potentially provide the base for higher levels of transformational leadership to have a positive impact on motivation and performance. The

level of integration and interdependencies that are needed for the new working environment will require leadership that goes beyond the more basic transactional style to styles that are more intellectually stimulating, inspirational and charismatic.

Based on research findings conducted by Metcalfe and Metcalfe (2000), such leadership will result in higher levels of cohesion, commitment, trust, motivation, and performance being observed in organisational environments.

For the purpose of this study, Bass and Avolio's (1999) definition of leadership styles is adopted. They emphasise that leadership styles have the following components: *Transformational styles* which include charismatic leaders having a vision, inspiring followers and changing and aligning systems to achieve these visions; *transactional* leadership styles which incorporates followers achieving negotiated levels of performance and *laissez-faire* leadership which is the most 'ineffective' form of leadership and suggests an absence of the leader. A distinction is made between these leadership styles in the following chapter.

The full range of leadership styles, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), implies that every leader displays a component of both transactional and transformational factors. Each leaders profile however involves more of one and less of the other. Those leaders more acceptable to their followers and who are more effective as leaders are more transformational and less transactional (Bass & Avolio, 1999). So too, members of transformational teams care more about each other, intellectually stimulate one another, inspire and identify with the teams goals, as opposed to transactional leadership styles. Transformational teams are also associated with high-performers, they promote employee creativity and flexibility. To understand the effects of transactional/transformational leadership on performance, it is necessary to be aware of the associated influencers on the construct (Bass & Avolio).

In this research, psychological strengths are studied from a fortigenic paradigm, which can be viewed as a further development of the salutogenic model of Antonovsky. Strümpfer (1995) argues, that to emphasise health as the core endpoint of a whole paradigm, is to limit the extent of the paradigm. He thus proposes that one is required to extend the construct of "salutogenesis" to "fortigenesis" concerning origins of strength in general areas of well-

being. The fortigenic orientation considers the origins of strength when researching psychological well-being. Psychological well-being is then influenced by various psychological or salutogenic strengths, namely hardiness, potency, sense of coherence, locus of control and self - efficacy. For the purposes of this study and thereof, the range of psychological strengths studied, was limited to sense of coherence, locus of control and self - efficacy.

According to Strümpfer (1995) individuals have resources to cope with these stressors which are omnipresent. When individuals have availability of these coping resources, an enhanced sense of coherence develops.

*Sense of Coherence* is a general way of appraising the world, both cognitively and emotionally, which is associated with effective coping, health-enhancing and better social adjustment. Strümpfer (1995) explains that the sense of coherence is not a particular coping style, but rather a disposition, which allows individuals to select appropriate strategies to deal with stressors confronting them. Antonovsky (1993) defines 'sense of coherence' as a global construct expressed in the extent to which an individual experiences an enduring feeling of confidence that their internal and external environments are structured, predictable and explicable; that the resources required to meet the demands posed by the stimuli are available and that the demands posed are challenges worthy of investment and commitment. The definition of sense of coherence includes three dimensions, which are comprehensibility, manageability and meaningfulness; also that a high level of sense of coherence should enable a person to apply a wide range of coping strategies in a flexible manner (Antonovsky).

*Self - efficacy* refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control their own behaviour. Many researchers describe self - efficacy as being commonly understood to be domain-specific, which implies that an individual may have firm beliefs in different domains or specific situations of functioning. General self -efficacy as stated by Schwarzer and Mueller (1999), is aimed at a broad sense of personal competence to deal effectively with a variety of stressful situations. Bandura (1997) claims that the development of self - efficacy is developed through learning and modelling of behaviours. Most modelling is based on observation and instructional learning. This method of modelling utilises self-instructional thoughts to guide performance (Gist, cited in Appelbaum & Hare, 1996). Research results have also attested to having a positive influence of self - efficacy perceptions on

performance. Several studies have shown that leadership behaviours affect perceptions of self - efficacy. These studies focused on external leadership, self- leadership and self-management on self - efficacy in different tasks and domains. Redmund, Mumford and Teach (cited in Robbins, 2001) found that leader behaviours, task-setting and goal-setting, positively influenced self - efficacy expectations. Sherer, Adams, Carley and Wiebe (cited in Robbins) found similar results in the influence of an entrepreneurial (leadership role), significantly affected subjects level of self - efficacy.

*The Locus of Control Scale (LOC)* was introduced by Rotter (cited in Rothmann, 2000) as an Internal versus External Locus of Control Scale. According to Rotter generalised expectancies of internal or external control of reinforcement determine and predict people's behaviour. In research conducted by Davis and Kirby (cited in Robbins, 2001), it is suggested that internal versus external locus of control might be situation-specific. This is also indicative of leadership styles as described in Situation and Trait theories. Introduced by Bandura (1986), self - efficacy offers an understanding of how to develop entrepreneurial characteristics and the capacity for gaining new knowledge and skills among organisational members and leaders. "Self - efficacy refers to one's belief in one's capability to perform a specific task"(Gist, cited in Appelbaum & Hare, 1996).

Leaders whose beliefs in their personal self - efficacy are high will be most likely to attempt the complex tasks involved in organisational change, learning and innovation. *Perceived self - efficacy* refers to individual's beliefs in their capabilities to exercise control over challenging demands and over their own functioning (Bandura, 1986). Perceived self - efficacy is required in order to overcome barriers and stimulate self-motivation repeatedly. Perceived self - efficacy operates in concert with risk perception, outcome expectancies, and other factors in influencing the motivation to change.

The sociopolitical changes in South Africa have moved SA from being a paternalistic to a democratic society. As a result these changes have had an impact on employee and manager relations in organisations. Leaders now need to establish a new culture and work context, which are in line with the socio political climate in order to remain competitive and productive. This new culture needs to be transparent, open and candid, empowering, adaptive, flexible and risk tolerant according to Kotter (1998).

The leader who demands, controls others and makes unilateral decisions does not fit into the new culture, structures and systems of 21<sup>st</sup> century organisations (Bennis, 1997; Kotter, 1998). These theories are all in agreement with team-building, coaching, collaboration, empowerment and relationship building. These traits, behaviours and characteristics are what signify winning organisations. The new work environment values listening, consensus, co-operation and team orientated decisions. This indicates a huge shift from transactional leadership to transformational management.

New visions are needed for what will be expected for South African organisations to be globally competitive. This is because South African managers are too internally focused, resulting in them being out of touch with the international economy (Bass, 1999). Following all the political changes which have taken place, corporate South Africa (SA) has become part of a competitive global village. Continuous changes in South African have resulted in organisations now being under increasing pressure to meet the new demands, being made aware of emerging markets and free trade. Change, transformation and adaptation have become critical for survival (Booyesen & Beaty, 1997).

The above is evidence that there is a great need for leaders in South Africa to be aware of their own leadership styles and adjust these to transformational styles, to improve an organisations competitive edge and sustainability, in these changing times.

In this study the information obtained can be of value in developing future leadership behaviours, challenges, change initiatives, recruitment, performance management and training in companies where high levels of transactional or laissez-faire leadership exist. The company in which the research will be undertaken is a subsidiary of a large international holding company. The study consists of the management team within the subsidiary.

On the basis of the above mentioned problem statement, the following research questions can be formulated:

- How are leadership styles (encompassing transformational, transactional and laissez-faire), sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy, and locus of control and the relationships between these constructs, conceptualised in the research literature?

- What are the types of leadership styles (namely; transformational, transactional, or non-leadership) and sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control of managers within the organisation?
- How do leadership styles, sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy, and locus of control differ in terms of gender, age, language, tenure and qualifications of managers within the organisation?
- What are the relationships between leadership styles and sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control of managers within the organisation?
- Can leadership styles predict sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control?

### **1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

#### **1.3.1 General Objective**

The general objective of this study is to establish the relationship between sense of coherence, self - efficacy, locus of control and transactional and transformational leadership styles.

#### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

The specific research objectives are to:

- Conceptualise transactional and transformational leadership from the literature
- Conceptualise the relationship between sense of coherence, self - efficacy, locus of control and transactional and transformational leadership from the literature
- Determine the levels of transactional and transformational leadership between the demographic variables within an organisation, using a biographical questionnaire
- Determine whether leadership is influenced by sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control.
- Determine the relationship between sense of coherence, self - efficacy, locus of control and leadership styles in a organisation

- Determine whether psychological strengths or constructs; sense of coherence, self - efficacy, locus of control can be used to predict transactional and transformational leadership in a organisation
- Determine the reliability and construct validity of the measuring instruments used in the study.

## **1.4 RESEARCH METHOD**

The research method consists of a literature review and an empirical study.

### **1.4.1 Phase 1: Literature review**

In the literature review, the focus is on previous research that has been done on leadership styles and psychological strengths (as measured by sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control).

The following databases were consulted.

- Psychlit
- Internet
- Reportorium of South African Journals
- Library Catalogues

### **1.4.2 Phase 2: Empirical study**

#### **1.4.2.1 Research design**

A non-experimental (correlational) research design involving measurements at a single time was used to reach the research objectives. Information collected was used to describe the population at a given time. The design can also be used to assess interrelationships among variables within a population. According to Shaughnessy and Zechmeister (1997) this design is ideally suited to the descriptive and predictive functions associated with correlational research.

### 1.4.2.2 Study population

The study sample consists of the whole population of 216 managers and supervisors, within the organisation. The sample is drawn from the category of Managers and Supervisors. The organisation has 1600 personnel and due to practical issues and time constraints this study concentrated on the above category only. The head of this organisation was willing to endorse the use of this specific sample.

### 1.4.2.3 Measuring instruments

The following questionnaires were used in the empirical study.

- *Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire* (Bass & Avolio, 1999)
- *Orientation to life Questionnaire* (Antonovsky, 1993)
- *General Perceived Self - efficacy Scale* (Schwarzer, 2001)
- *Work Locus of control Scale* (Spector, 1988)

#### ▪ Independent Variables

*The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)* (Bass & Avolio, 1999). This 45 item questionnaire relating to leadership styles will be used to measure the perceived leadership styles of supervisors and managers. The items of the MLQ measuring leadership styles are reported to have a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0,944; 0,736 and 0,803 for transformational, transactional and non-transactional leadership respectively (Bass & Avolio).

#### ▪ Dependant Variables

*The Orientation to Life Questionnaire* (Antonovsky, 1979) was used to measure participants' sense of coherence. This questionnaire was developed to measure sense of coherence, which consists of three interrelated components: meaningfulness, comprehensibility and manageability. Sense of coherence, expresses an individuals global-orientation to life. The scale exists in two forms, the original 29 item scale and a shortened 13 item version which have highly reliable measures. The criterion validity of the OLQ shows a high correlation with the scores of other constructs of generalised *perception of self* and the *environment*, such

as locus of control and hardiness. According to Antonovsky the consistently high level of Cronbach's alpha coefficient which ranges from 0,84 to 0,93 is illustrative of a reputable degree of internal consistency and the reliability of the OLQ.

The *General Perceived Self - efficacy Questionnaire* (GPSES) (Schwarzer, 2001), was used to measure a candidates' self - efficacy. The GPSES consists of ten statements about how respondents expect to manage difficult situations in the future. There are four response alternatives, 1 (low) to 4 (high), on each item implying a total score between 10 and 40. The scale has good internal reliability, Cronbach alpha varies between 0,74 and 0,93 and is valid in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. The research of Rothmann (2000) illustrated a reliability coefficient of 0,80.

The *Work Locus of Control Scale* (WLCS) (Spector, 1988) is a 16-item measure of generalized control beliefs in the organisational and work-related setting. Items are scored on a seven point Likert type response format, ranging from (1) "Disagree very much" to (7) "Agree very much". Scores range from 16 to 112, where low scores represent internality and high scores externality. Spector reports significant correlations with Rotter's general internal-external Locus of Control Scale. In addition, Spector, reports Cronbach's alpha coefficients, indicating internal consistency, of 0,85 for 4 independent samples and coefficients of 0,75 and 0,80 for a further 2 samples. The Work Locus of Control Scale has also been used in several South African studies where similar reliability coefficients were yielded. In a study by Nunns and Argyris (cited in Abrams, 1985), the scale was found to demonstrate an acceptable level of reliability coefficient of 0,84. In another study the Cronbach's alpha was 0,80 which is deemed to be an acceptable reliability. The research of Rothmann (2000) delivered an alpha coefficient of 0,70.

The *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1999) measures the levels of transformational, transactional and non-leadership and consist of 45 items. Each item is completed using a 5 point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A sample item representing transformational leader behaviour is "My leader got me to look at the task from many different angles." A sample item representing transactional leader behaviour is "My leader pointed out what our goal was." Reliabilities were transformational and transactional leadership scales are 0,84 and 0,86 respectively. The

TLQ comprises of nine scales / factors, each with a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of = 0,85 – 0,97. The inter item coefficients all exceeded the  $r = 0,30$ .

*Scale 1* = Genuine concern for others (17 items)

*Scale 2* = Political sensitivity and skills (6 items)

*Scale 3* = Decisiveness, determination, self-confidence (8 items)

*Scale 4* = Integrity, trustworthy, honest and open (9 items)

*Scale 5* = Empowers, develops potential (8 items)

*Scale 6* = Inspirational networker and promoter (10 items)

*Scale 7* = Accessible, approachable (6 items)

*Scale 8* = Clarifies boundaries, involve others in decisions (5 items)

*Scale 9* = Encourages critical and strategic thinking (7 items)

#### **1.4.2.4 Research procedure**

The measuring battery compiled, was provided to members after a meeting was held with them in which the purpose of the study, anonymity, the confidentiality of the data collected, as well as general logistical arrangements were communicated. The above was also again indicated in a cover letter, which accompanied the measuring battery. The results were analysed and feedback given to the management team of the organisation. Individual, general feedback was provided on request.

#### **1.4.2.5 Statistical analysis**

The statistical analysis was implemented with the assistance of the Statistical Consultation services of the PU for CHE. Cronbach alpha coefficients, inter-item correlation coefficients and confirmatory factor analysis were used to assess the reliability and validity of the measuring instruments. Descriptive statistics (e.g. means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis) were used to analyse data. The mean indicates the average score obtained by the research group on each measuring instrument and the standard deviation indicates the extent to which individual scores differ from the mean obtained. In the study T-tests were used in order to decide the significance of sizes. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was determined to indicate the extent to which one variable was related to another. The practical significance of the findings was determined with the use of multiple

regression analysis. A correlation can be better understood by determining  $r^2$  (Cohen, 1990). The square of the correlation co-efficient, indicated the proportion of variance in two variables, which was predicted by the variance in the other. Canonical correlations were used to determine the correlation between leadership styles and psychological strengths in total (as measured by sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control).

## **1.5 CHAPTER DIVISION**

- Chapter 1: Introduction, problem statement of transactional and transformational styles, research objectives and methodology
- Chapter 2: Transformational and transactional leadership styles, sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control
- Chapter 3: Empirical research
- Chapter 4: Results and discussion of the empirical study
- Chapter 5: Conclusion, limitations and recommendations

## **1.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In Chapter 1, which serves as an introduction, the problem statement, purpose of the study, and research methodology and procedure are provided, as well as an indication of the content of the chapters to follow.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

Chapter 1, which serves as an introduction, provides the problem statement, purpose of the study, including a discussion of the research methodology and procedure. As indicated in Chapter 1, leadership studies have been conducted throughout the ages and have yielded many interesting results. The one aspect of research in leadership studies; namely that of being related to gender, have until recently been ignored. Even popular writings and management research have ignored this aspect of leadership. Leadership styles too have until recently also been under utilised and it is for these above-mentioned reasons that the following study was initiated.

In the section that follows the researcher will attempt to define leadership, based on literature studies, which were previously conducted by various theorists. Thereafter, the history of leadership theories will be traced from past to present day, in order to develop a current theoretical frame from which to work. This frame of reference will form the foundation of the way Transformational, Transactional and Non-leadership will be conceptualised, for the purposes of the current research. In addition, these leadership styles and behaviours will be utilised to determine and understand how the behaviours, traits and other factors have influenced, evolved and changed with time, role complexity, and gender expectations. However, a starting point in identifying the above is to define a concept of a leader as opposed to being a manager and determining what constitutes a leader being effective.

#### **2.2 CONCEPTUALISING LEADERSHIP**

In defining the concept of 'Leadership' it is important to clarify the differences between other concepts used in the literature for the purposes of this study.

Defining the concepts of Management and Leadership are important to the present research, as they are concepts that the authors use interchangeably in consulted literature. However, the definitions are quite different in their meaning as discussed below. Firstly, Leadership as a

concept will be discussed followed by an explanation of the term Management and then the Leadership styles pertaining to each of the constructs will be defined. The primary objective in the development of the above mentioned, is the formulation of a definition of leadership. More specifically, one needs to distinguish between 'management' as a concept and 'leadership' as a concept. This becomes more apparent when one views the former as being about 'doing things right', whereas the latter concerns 'doing the right things' as mentioned by Burns and Leone (1997). A more detailed discussion will be provided in the section that follows.

The concept of 'Management' is about coping with complexity, according to John Kotter of The Harvard Business Review (1998). Kotter suggests that 'order and consistency' are a direct result of good management, which is brought about through formal planning, designing of organisational structures and monitoring the results. In addition, Robbins and Burns (2000) claim that managers use the authority of their rank to ensure compliance from their members. The concept of management may then consist of implementing the organisational strategy by leaders, through motivating, assisting and co-ordinating work activities of their employees.

Robbins (2001) mentions that 'leadership' is about 'change and coping with this change.' In direct support with this statement, Burns and Leone (1997) views leadership as a *structure of action* that engages others in *leading change*. Two essential components in his definition are *power, motive and resource*. Burns and Leone (p. 259) states further that, 'the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers ' values and motivations'. A more current view by Robbins (2001), states that leaders establish direction in developing a vision for the future and aligning people with this vision. This is initiated through communicating the vision to people, inspiring them to achieve and overcoming any challenges.

A definition of 'leadership' then according to the researcher, is the ability to influence a group toward achieving their individual or collective goals. The source of this influence may be formal, for example, using the managerial rank of a leader in an organisation to influence others. The concept of 'leader' then refers to the actual *position* whereas the concept 'manager and management' refers to the *rank* the leader has within the organisation.

In agreement with the above definition, Robbins (2001) states that since some management positions come with some degree of formal, designated authority, a person may assume a leadership role simply because of the position he or she holds in the organisation. However, he states further that not all leaders are managers and conversely, not all managers are leaders; which is where the distinction between 'management' and 'leadership' becomes apparent. Should an organisation provide managers with some authorities, it is not to say that the manager will lead the organisation effectively. Often non-sanctioned leadership; which is the ability to influence others, arises outside formal structures of the organisation and is often more important than formal influence (Robbins). The above statement supports then that leaders and leadership may arise in a group setting naturally without any formal leadership appointments being required.

The concept of being a 'leader' also involves the *needs* of both 'leaders' and 'those being led'. Former ways of working do not suffice anymore and in pursuit of these 'needs' is an omnipotence (Vansina, cited in Robbins, 2001), which is often ascribed and expected from 'the leader'. Much more power is attributed to the leader, than the leader actually experiences. On the contrary, leaders often complain of the lack of control they feel (Morgan, cited in Robbins). Yet leaders implement and find they techniques to change themselves and take control and shape their organisations to better-suit their ever-changing work environments. The author then further defines the concept of a 'leader' as constituting those intrinsic needs, traits, characteristics and genders, which may also be acquired through experience, in influencing others to achieve collective goals.

In defining the concept of 'leadership' then, there is a wide consensus among theorists that a leader contributes a great deal to the success or failure of an organisation (Fiedler & House, cited in Robbins, 2001). Ivancevich and Matteson (cited in Robbins) argue that "organisations would be less efficient without leaders, and in extreme cases would be unable to accomplish purposeful goals". Despite the proliferation of research, there remains a lack of consensus on what exactly *constitutes leadership* and the *influences* on leadership styles (Bass, 1985); and also what exactly determines the *effectiveness* of a leader (Cohen, 1990). It is the task of organisational leadership practices such as; visionary and inspirational leadership (Bass), charismatic leadership (Bass) and more generally, transformational leadership (Burns & Leone, 1997) to transform the beliefs and attitudes of employees in line with the organisations mission and objectives.

Many of the leadership theories which have been developed, arose from the researchers conception of what they believe constitutes a successful leader (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, cited in Robbins, 2001). As with different interpretations of leadership, notions of *leadership effectiveness* differ. The suggested consequences or outcomes of successful leadership include the following criteria: The attainment of group goals, employee satisfaction with the leader, group or team survival, voluntary turnover, follower commitment to group goals as well as the leaders retention of status in the group (Yukl, 1991). This type of leadership effectiveness is important to the current study, as it demonstrates behaviours, traits and characteristics, which affect and influence employee motivation, commitment and success levels. A leaders' effectiveness is thus evident in the successful accomplishment of goals through the input of others. This is also made evident in the Leaders perception and assessment of his/her own leadership style as measured in the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). One of the constructs the questionnaire measures is the effectiveness of the leaders style in accomplishing objectives and how leadership effectiveness is influenced by gender. Furthermore, the questionnaire will determine the levels of leadership as described in 'laissez-faire (non-leadership), management-by-exception (transformational leadership) and passive management (transactional leadership), respectively.

One of the hypotheses of the study is identifying whether effective leadership styles are influenced by a leader's sense of coherence, self- efficacy and locus of control.

In the following section, various theories will be consulted to determine which traits, approaches, situations, behaviours and other influencers impact on leadership styles. Furthermore, theoretical approaches will provide clarification regarding what predicts and constitutes leadership effectiveness.

## **2.3 THE HISTORY AND ORIGIN OF LEADERSHIP ACCORDING TO THEORETICAL APPROACHES**

### **2.3.1 The Trait or Great Man Theories**

In research conducted by Trait theorists in the early 1930's to 1950's, leadership research was aimed at identifying a specific set of personal attributes of leaders, who had the ability to influence and command the respect of their followers. This research focused on personality,

social, physical and intellectual attributes that would describe leaders and differentiate them from those who are not leaders, dates as far back as the 1930's. Many of these research efforts were ineffective in achieving their desired outcome. Researchers found it impossible to identify a set of traits that would differentiate them from ineffective leaders. However, they were able to identify traits that were consistently associated with leadership.

Recent research, as identified by Robbins (2001) provides evidence that people who are high self-monitors – that is, they are highly flexible in *adjusting* their behaviour in different situations- are more likely to emerge as leaders in a group than low self-monitors – those who are rigid and resist changing their behaviour according to the situation. Furthermore, it may also be assumed that although some traits increase the likelihood of success as a leader, they do not guarantee success. This is indicated in some leaders having the attributes and personality, which constitute being effective leaders, yet they may lack the skills or knowledge to lead people effectively.

In contrast to the above statements, Trait theorists also assumed that effective leaders have a finite number of individual traits or characteristics which are stable and frequent across a range of situations (Bass & Stodgill, 1990). These traits were thought to be innate and extraordinary (Gibson, et al., cited in Robbins, 2001).

Intellectual, personality and certain physical traits of successful leaders, according to early trait theorists, were focused on yielding the following results:

*Intellectual Traits:* After reviewing 33 studies, Bass and Stodgill (1990) found a general trend which indicated that leaders are more intelligent than their followers. Of significance is the finding that there are extreme intelligence differences, which can become dysfunctional (for example leaders may experience difficulty in understanding why employees do not comprehend a problem or find it difficult sharing their viewpoints). According to early trait theorists, successful leaders were also found to be decisive and knowledgeable with exceptional judgement and verbal abilities. According to Sosik (cited in Bass & Stodgill) and his colleagues, intellectual stimulation is a key characteristic of transformational leadership, which is likely to encourage followers to 'think out the box' and enhance explorative thinking. Transformational leaders stimulate their followers to think about old problems in new ways (Bass, 1985).

*Personality Traits:* Robbins (2001) found that Argyris associated alertness, personal integrity, originality, self-confidence, dominance and drive for responsibility with effective leadership. After his study, Bass (1985) attributed non-conformity, emotional balance and creativity to successful leaders while Ghiselli (cited in Bass) found the ability to initiate action to be a dominant personality trait among leaders.

*Physical Traits:* Various attempts were made to link successful leadership with physical characteristics such as age, height, weight and appearance however contradictory results emerged which rendered these studies futile (Ivancevich & Matteson, cited in Robbins, 2001). Evidence in research studies on replication studies remains inconclusive in predicting leadership success. Yukl (1991) although sceptical of the trait approach indicates that trait theories are re-emerging in the literature.

Robbins (2001) claims that there are at least four limitations of Trait theory. Firstly, there are *no universal traits* that predict leadership in all situations. There are however traits which predict leadership in *selective* situations. Secondly, Robbins states that traits predict behaviour more in 'weak situations' than in 'strong situations.' These strong situations are those in which strong behavioural norms exist, including strong incentives for specific behaviours and clearly defined expectations of which behaviours are rewarded and punished. These strong situations, in turn create less opportunity for leaders to express their inherent dispositional tendencies. In many organisations, a highly structured, formal culture exists which fits the description of strong situations, limiting the power of traits to predict leadership. Thirdly, there is no clear evidence in differentiating between cause and effect. In other words, are leaders self-confident or does becoming a successful leader build the self-confidence? Lastly, traits do not distinguish between effective versus ineffective leaders; they seem to do a better job of predicting the appearance of leadership.

As result of criticism, researchers shifted their focus from the search of leadership traits to leadership behaviour and its impact on performance and satisfaction of followers, which is known as the Personal Behavioural Approach.

Behavioural research emerged in the 1950's as a result of researchers wondering if there was a unique way in which leaders behaved. If behavioural studies were able to identify behavioural determinants of leadership, this would imply that organisations could *train*

people to be leaders. The difference between trait theories and behaviourists, is that trait theories believe that leadership is *inborn* whereas behaviourists believe leadership may be *taught*. This became a desirable concept because the supply of leaders could be multiplied. According to a recent leadership benchmark survey conducted by Development Dimensions International (DDI), 2000, the greatest challenge facing businesses for the future is developing leadership potential. The behavioural approach is a desirable solution to ensure effective leaders are trained to be effective, in achieving performance objectives. The following two theories propose that specific behaviours differentiate leaders (transactional and transformational) from non-leaders (*laissez-faire*).

### **2.3.2 The Personal Behavioural Theories**

#### **2.3.2.1 Ohio State Studies**

Conducted in the late 1940's, researchers sought to identify *dimensions* of leadership behaviour. The list was eventually narrowed into two categories, which accounted for leadership behaviour described by employees. These two dimensions were called *Initiating Structure* and *Consideration*.

Initiating Structure refers to the extent to which a leader defines and structures his/her role and those of the employees in attaining their goals. This behaviour includes work relationships, organising work, and goals. The type of leader who is characterised as being 'high in initiating structure' is described as someone who assigns tasks to group members, expects specific standards of performance of the members and meeting deadlines. Consideration is described as the extent to which a person is likely to have job relationships characterised by trust, respect for feelings and understanding. A leader who is high in consideration may be described as one who helps employees with their problems, treats employees as equals and is approachable. Robbins (2001) says that leaders high in initiating structure and consideration, achieve high employee performance and satisfaction more often than those rated low on either consideration, initiating structure or both. However, he also claims that a high score on both is not always positive. For example, a leader high in 'initiating structure' led to greater rates of grievances, absenteeism and turn over and lower levels of job satisfaction. Other studies found that high 'consideration' was negatively related to performance ratings of the leader by his / her superior. In conclusion, the Ohio State

studies suggest that the 'high' style generally results in positive outcomes, however enough evidence was found to indicate that situational factors need to be integrated into the theory.

### **2.3.2.2 University of Michigan Studies**

A major research programme on *leadership behaviour* was conducted by researchers at the University of Michigan. The purpose of the study was to identify relationships of leader behaviour, group processes and measures of group performance. Robert Likert and his research team identified two distinct leadership styles which were referred to as '*job or production orientated*' and '*relationship or employee-orientated*'. The *job-centred leader* places emphasis on the technical aspects of the task and its accomplishment. This type of leader closely supervises employees after having stipulated specific tasks and procedures. *Task-orientated* functions include planning and scheduling the work, co-ordinating employee activities and providing tools to complete tasks (Yukl, 1991). This type of leader relies on coercion, reward and legitimate power to influence the behaviour and performance of followers. Coercive power refers to compliance by the follower in order to avoid punishments.

The employee-centred or relationship orientated leader is one who shows an interest in *interpersonal relations* and employees *personal needs*, advancement and achievement. The Michigan studies found that for effective leaders, task-orientated behaviour did not occur in isolation from the concern for human relations (Yukl, 1991). Employee-centred behaviour is demonstrated by the delegation of decision-making, informing followers and showing appreciation for their ideas, contributions and accomplishments. The relationship-orientated leader tends to use general supervision, as opposed to closed supervision: s(he) allows employees some autonomy in deciding how to work and how to pace themselves. It should be pointed out that some writers consider the encouragement of employee participation decision-making to be a third dimension of leadership behaviour which emerged from the Michigan studies. This 'category' is sometimes referred to as participative leadership and encompasses delegation and consultation of followers on decisions.

Regarding the current study, the findings strongly favoured the leaders who were employee-orientated in their behaviour. Employee orientated leaders were associated with higher group

productivity and increased job satisfaction. Production-orientated leaders tended to be associated with low group productivity and lower job satisfaction.

### **2.3.3 The Managerial Grid Theories**

Developed in the 1970's by Blake and Mouton, the Managerial Grid was based on a two-dimensional view of leadership styles (Robbins, 2001). The proposed styles were "concern for people" and "concern for production" which is similar to that of the dimensions 'consideration and initiating structure', of the Ohio State dimensions and 'employee and production orientated' dimensions of the Michigan studies. The grid depicts nine positions on which axis a leaders style may fall. The grid reflects the *dominant* indicators a leader portrays in achieving results.

Criticism of this model is the lack of substantive evidence, which exists to support the conclusion that a 9,9 style is the most effective leadership style. The grid does however reflect a good *conceptualisation* of the various leadership styles.

The behavioural approaches outlined above were developed during the 1940's and early 1960's when leadership behaviours were relatively stable and structured. In a changing world, such as we live in now, leadership is not a constant, and effective leaders now need to be more development-orientated and flexible, according to Robbins (2001). These leaders are supportive coaches, more risk-orientated and are experimental and change-orientated individuals. Critique of the above theory is the *situational factors*, which are absent in the findings and which directly impact on the success or failure of a leader.

### **2.3.4 The Situational Models of Contingency Theories**

Fiedler's Contingency Model proposes that *effective group performance* depends on the leaders style, the extent to which the leader has control of the situation and the interaction with employees. A key factor in this approach for Fiedler is the leaders style. To identify the different styles, Fiedler developed the least preferred co-worker (LPC) questionnaire. This questionnaire determines whether the leader is task or relationship orientated. The questionnaire consists of 16 contrasting adjectives (for example, pleasant-unpleasant; efficient-inefficient). It asks respondents to think of co-workers they have worked with and to

describe the person they least enjoyed working with and to rate that experience on a scale of 1-8. Fiedler believes that based on the responses to the LPC questionnaire, the basic leadership style, may be determined. If you describe the person you are least able to work with in positive terms, Fiedler would label you as *relationship orientated*. Conversely, should you be described the person in *unfavourable terms*, the respondent is interested in productivity, thus labelled *task orientated*. Furthermore, Fiedler states that an individual's leadership style is fixed. This statement is important because it means that if the situation requires a task orientated leader and the person in the relationship is relationship orientated, the situation has to be modified or the leader removed and replaced in order for optimum effectiveness to be achieved.

Fiedler identifies three dimensions, which define the situational factors, which determine the leadership effectiveness. These three dimensions are *leader-member relations*, *task structure* and *position power*. Robbins (2001) defines these further as follows:

1. Leader-member relations – The degree of confidence, trust and respect members have in their leaders
2. Task structure – The degree to which the job tasks are structured or unstructured
3. Position power – The degree of influence a leader has over power variables such as recruitment, selection, salary increments and promotions.

The next step in the Fiedler model is to *evaluate* the situation, taking these three dimensions into consideration. Fiedler states further that in combining these three variables, there are potentially different situations in which leaders may find themselves and it is how they react in these situations, which determines their *style*. According to Fiedler, task-orientated leaders tend to perform better in situations that are favourable to them (high and low control). In contrast relationship-orientated leaders perform better in moderately favourable situations (moderate control).

The above is evident that one needs to match the leader to the specific situation. The leader in this instance is the primary decision-maker and may need to change and restructure tasks in order to control tasks, activities and actions. Fiedler's model evidently has positive evidence, which substantiates the above model. However there are potential problems with the model in that the logic underlying it is not well understood and studies have shown that the LPC scores

are not stable. Robbins (2001) says that it is very difficult to determine how good the leader-member relations are, how structured the task is and how much position power the leader has as these are constantly changing.

### **2.3.5 Cognitive Resource Theory**

In addition, Fiedler and Garcia (cited in Robbins, 2001) focused on the role of stress as a form of situational unfavourableness and the manner in which a leader's intelligence and experience influence their reaction to stress. This re-conceptualisation is named cognitive resource theory. This theory claims that stress affects the situation in an unfavourable manner and that it is difficult for a leader to think and act intelligently when faced with stress. A leader's effectiveness then is dependant on the amount of high-or-low stress situation.

### **2.3.6 The Situational Model Theory**

In the 1980's, Hersey and Blanchard developed a leadership model called situational leadership theory (SLT). In Situational Theory, leadership effectiveness is a function of a variety of factors, which vary according to the nature of the leadership situation (Ivancevich & Matteson, cited in Robbins, 2001). These theories assume that different situations require different traits and patterns of behaviour to be effective. These aspects are commonly referred to as situational moderator variables (Yukl, 1991). The situational theories added and concentrated more on a distinct dimension, namely the differences among employees and situations. This is made evident in successful leadership, which according to Hersey and Blanchard (cited in Robbins, 2001), is achieved through selecting the correct leadership style and focusing it on the followers. Leadership effectiveness, as discussed in previous sections is determined by followers either choosing to accept or reject the leader. This effectiveness then is dependant on the actions and input of the followers. This dimension is important in leadership theories, as the leader's level of effectiveness *depends* on the actions of followers mentioned above. This dimension has been overlooked in previous leadership research.

Hersey and Blanchard refer to this as 'readiness' and state that it refers to the extent to which people have the *ability and willingness* to accomplish a specific task (Robbins, 2001). SLT views the relationship as similar to that of parent and child relations. Hersey and Blanchard

identify four specific leadership behaviours – from laissez-faire, impoverished leaders to highly directive, team leaders.

According to the SLT approach, should a follower display *unable* and *willing* behaviour – the leader needs to display high task orientation (telling approach) to compensate for their lack of ability to buy into the leaders ways. Similarly, if followers are both *able* and *willing* the leader needs to provide a supportive and participative style (selling approach). In addition, Hersey and Blanchard (cited in Robbins, 2001), advocate that the level of employee maturity determines the optimal level of leadership behaviour. As employee maturity increases from the minimum amount to a moderate level, the leader should use more *people relations* behaviour and less *task behaviour*. As employee maturity increases beyond the moderate level the leader should decrease the amount of *relations behaviour*, while continuing to decrease the amount of task behaviour. When the employee is immature in relation to the task, the leaders task behaviour should be dominant. Both task and relationship behaviour should be exercised for employees with a moderate amount of maturity. When a follower is *very mature* the leader should *delegate* responsibility for deciding how work is done and allow considerable autonomy.

The SLT approach acknowledges the importance of followers and the ability of leaders to compensate for the motivational limits of their followers. However, research to support and test the theory has been disappointing. There are ambiguities and inconsistencies in the model and problems with the research methodology, which led to the formation of leader-member exchange theory.

### **2.3.7 Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

The above theory argues that leaders sometimes act very differently toward different people and may consist of an *in-group* and *out-group*, when working with teams. The leader-member exchange theory (LMX), argues that due to time pressures, leaders establish special relationships with this small group of followers. These people make up the in-group and the remainder of the followers form the out-group. They receive less of the leaders time, fewer rewards and have leader-follower relations based on formal authority relationships. The above theory proposes that the leader categorises the follower as ‘in’ or ‘out’. There is evidence that leaders tend to choose the ‘in-group’ members because they display similar

characteristics and attitudes as the leader. Important to note here is that it is the followers characteristics that are the driving force in the leaders categorisation exercise.

Research in testing the LMX theory has provided support that leaders do differentiate among followers and that followers with in-group status have higher performance ratings, lower turnover intentions, greater satisfaction than those experienced by the out-group. According to Robbins (2001) leaders invest their resources with those whom they expect to perform best. Similar to the 'self-fulfilling' prophecy, leaders treat their followers, 'knowing' that they are the most competent and treat them as such to fulfil their own prophecies.

### **2.3.8 The Path-Goal Theories**

Developed by House, Path-Goal theory is a contingency model of leadership, which extracts elements from the Ohio state studies on *initiating structure* and *consideration* and the *expectancy theory of motivation*. The Path Goal Model addresses leader behaviours, which enable group members to gain satisfaction through achieving their goals and to provide support and direction that the goals achieved are compatible with the organisations or the teams goals.

This model can be thought of as a *transactional* model in that there exists an exchange or social contract between the leader and group members. Accordingly, the definition of leadership as proposed by Jacobs (1970) is congruent with this transactional approach. According to Cohen (1990), this transactional relationship will endure as long as the mutual needs of the leader and follower can be satisfied by continuing the exchange of performance for rewards (which are usually tangible and calculable). In this model House (1970), suggested *four basic leadership styles*: the first three styles were drawn from personal behaviour theories:

1. Directive – similar to initiating structure – the leader who identifies specific expectations and goals and lets followers know what is expected of them; schedules work to be done and gives guidance on how to accomplish tasks (Transactional leadership style)
2. Supportive – similar to consideration – the leader considering the personal needs of followers and is friendly (Transformational leadership style)

3. Participative – the leader who consults and considers the ideas of employees prior to reaching a decision; (Transformational leadership style)
4. Achievement Orientated – the leader who sets challenging goals and expects excellence in performance from employees at their highest level (Ivancevich & Matteson, cited in Robbins, 2001).

In contrast to Fielder, House (1971) acknowledges that leaders are flexible and adaptable and that the same leader may display these behaviours depending on the situation. This implies that a *leaders behavioural style is largely dependant on the situation* and not vice versa. Path Goal Theory suggests that leadership styles and employees behaviour are contingent on two variables: (1) employee/personal characteristics and (2) environmental factors. In other words those that are in the environment; that are outside the control of the employee (task, structure, authority system and the work group) and those that are part of the personal characteristics of the employee (locus of control, experience and perceived ability). Environmental factors determine the type of leader behaviour if follower outcomes are to be maximised; while personal characteristics of the employee determine how the environment and leader behaviour are interpreted. This theory then proposes that leader behaviour is ineffective when made redundant with sources of environmental structure or is incongruent with employee characteristics.

Robbins (2001), cites the following as predictions based on Path-Goal theory:

1. Directive leadership leads to greater satisfaction when tasks are ambiguous or stressful than when they are highly structured and well laid out.
2. Supportive leadership results in high employee performance and satisfaction when employees are performing structured tasks.
3. Directive leadership is likely to be perceived as redundant among employees with high-perceived ability or with considerable experience.
4. Employees with an internal locus of control will be more satisfied with a participative style.
5. Achievement-orientated leadership will increase employee's expectancies that effort will lead to high performance when tasks are ambiguously structured.

These characteristics are further substantiated by (Robbins, 2001), who outlines the following variables as fundamental to this approach namely; Personal Characteristics. These include:

being they stress emotional and symbolic leader behaviours. Secondly, they explain how leaders achieve extraordinary levels of follower commitment and thirdly that they view leadership in a contemporary, simple way.

### **2.3.11 Charismatic Leadership**

Charismatic theory states that followers make attributions of extraordinary leadership abilities when they observe certain leadership behaviours. Most studies on this theory have studied the differentiation between charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. Many have also included identifying the personal characteristics of charismatic leaders such as a vision, willing to take risks, being sensitive to environmental constraints and follower needs and exhibiting behaviours that are not the norm. The manner in which charismatic leaders influence their followers suggests a four-step process as illustrated by Robbins (2001). The leader supplying followers a vision initiates the process, the leader communicates performance expectations and expresses confidence in them attaining the outcomes. This then enhances followers' self-esteem and confidence in their own ability.

The leader then conveys a set of actions and values and through the leaders' own example, indicates the set of behaviours for followers to imitate. Finally, the leader demonstrates courage and convictions regarding the vision, which then sets the example for others. The effect is motivated followers who make the extra effort and express greater satisfaction. These abilities may either be inherited or learned. The individual requires an optimistic view and in so doing, develops a charismatic aura. In addition then, the leader also creates a bond with others, by drawing them in and thirdly by tapping into their emotions and in so doing bringing out their potential. Robbins (2001) claims that leadership may not always need to achieve high levels of employee performance. Events and environments with a high level of stress and uncertainty seem to encourage charisma to emerge from leaders. There is often an ideological vision, which is also associated with charismatic leaders.

### **2.3.12 The Emergence Of The "New Paradigm" Model Theories – Transformational Leadership And Transactional Leadership**

In the new 'paradigm of leadership development' concepts of "transforming leadership" (Burns, 1978), "transformational leadership" (Bass, 1985), "visionary leadership" (Collins &

Porrás, cited in Robbins, 2001), “inspirational leadership” (Bass) are concepts, which relate leadership to motivating people, formulating and co-developing, appealing to visions and effecting change. In contrast to transformational leadership, transactional leadership tends to be based on an exchange process whereby followers are rewarded for accomplishing specified goals (Hollander, cited in Robbins, 2001). With transactional leadership, followers are typically given rewards in exchange for achieving certain levels of performance (Waldman, Bass & Yammarino, cited in Robbins).

Transformational leaders are charismatic and hence there will be some overlap in what is mentioned in this section with that of the previous section. Bass (1985) states that transformational leadership qualities are affected by individual’s childhood experiences. In addition, he dictates research findings that transformational leaders show their parents as being caring and setting challenging goals. Furthermore, it may also be assumed that transformational leaders have distinct personality attributes, different from those found in transactional leaders. Can one learn and change to become a transformational leader? Barling, Weber and Kelloway (1996) conducted a research study to determine whether transformational leadership could be developed and found that managers who received training were rated by their employees as being more transformational. The leadership theories presented namely; the Ohio State studies, Fiedlers’ model, path-goal theory and the leader participation model have discussed transactional leaders. Transactional leaders motivate and guide their followers in achieving their goals through clarifying task and role expectations.

In contrast, the transformational leader inspires followers to rise above their own self-interests, for the good of the organisation and in turn has a powerful effect on followers. These transformational leaders pay attention to the needs of their followers, assist them in looking at old problems in new ways and they inspire followers to achieve. This type of leadership of being either transactional and/or transformational should not be viewed in isolation from one another or in opposition to one another. According to Robbins (2001) transformational leadership is built on top of transactional leadership - it produces levels of follower - effort and performance, which extends beyond what would occur with a transactional approach alone. He states further that transformational leadership is more than ‘charisma’ alone, as the transformational leader instils an ability for the follower to question and challenge the leader. In evidence of the above it was found that transformational

leadership is more strongly correlated than transactional leadership with; lower turnover rates, higher productivity and higher employee satisfaction.

## 2.4 MEASURING TRANSACTIONAL AND TRANSFORMATIONAL STYLES

The Multifactor leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Bass and Avolio (1990a), has been widely used to measure transactional and transformational leadership styles. As summarised by Bass (1999), inter correlations among the transformational scales are high. The four basic transformational dimensions, namely; *idealised influence*, *inspirational motivation*, *individualised consideration* and *intellectual stimulation*, are strongly correlated with each other, based on previous studies.

It has been argued that transformational leadership acts upon employee's self-esteem and self-concept (Shamir, House & Arthur, cited in Bass, 1999). However, current definitions of transformational components suggest that it is through *idealized influence* (charisma), that leaders may best close the gap between the organisations mission and the *individuals self-concept* (self-efficacy). Furthermore, empirical research shows that transformational leadership results in better performance of subordinates than does transactional leadership. Transactional leadership components consist of *contingent reward*, whereby approved follower actions are rewarded and disapproved actions sanctioned or punished. *Management by exception (active)* involves intervening when judged appropriate and *Management by exception (passive)* involves correction only when problems emerge – these are corrective transactional dimensions. The *Laissez-Faire* is an absence of leadership and is a style of leadership, deemed to be most ineffective.

In addition, some studies show that both leadership styles had strong relationships with performance indices (Curphy, cited in Bass, 1999). Managers may also be promoted because of their transactional abilities to work within the system (Bass & Avolio, 1999). The finding that has remained consistent is that the absence of leadership namely, *laissez-faire leadership* (non-leadership) has been found to be ineffective and dissatisfying for most followers (Bass).

Research studies need to determine which transformational component is strongly associated with employees' sense of identity and self-esteem (self-efficacy). Furthermore, *individualised consideration* may be related to individuals need for support (sense of coherence) and to

encourage personal growth. This individualised consideration could have detrimental effects in specific contexts. On research conducted using a leadership questionnaire Vandenberg and Gobert (cited in Robbins, 1999) found that it resulted in less satisfaction with the leader. Post-hoc interviews found that a leader that was individually considerate, was perceived as threatening and individualised consideration was perceived as a mark of favouritism and inequity.

Being both a transformational and charismatic leader, refers to the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organisational members and building their commitment to organisations (Bass, 1985). Charismatic and transformational theories focus on the affective or emotional responses of the *followers* (Fiedler & House, cited in Robbins, 2001). There is considerable overlap between charismatic and transformational leadership. Burns (1978, p. 210) defines transformational leadership as a process in which ‘leaders and followers *raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation*’. Such leaders raise the consciousness of followers by appealing to their higher ideals and moral values such as honesty, justice, fairness, equality and liberty and not to more primitive emotions such as fear, greed, jealousy or hatred. Thus, in terms of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs – transformational leadership activates *higher order needs* in their followers.

“Charisma is a necessary ingredient of transformational leadership however on its own is insufficient to account for the transformational process” (Bass, 1985, p. 31). This style of ‘charisma’ is described in respect to how followers perceive and react towards the leader – charisma is idealised influence and inspiration. Transformational leadership influences followers by arousing *strong* emotions and *identification* with the leader. There are three factors, which influence the transformational leader.

1. Charisma (the most important factor) – the ability to instil a sense of faith, value, respect and pride in followers.
2. Individual attention or consideration – sensitivity to followers needs by designating meaningful projects to them, being encouraging and supportive; implying that attention is being paid to the subordinate in the form of mentoring and developmental orientation; and

3. Intellectual stimulation – the leader encourages followers to be creative and providing the climate for the followers to question their ways as well as those of their leader (Bass, 1985).

Transformational leadership is a special type of transactional leadership, however, there are differences. Transformational leaders tend to motivate followers to work for *long-term goals*, which usually provide intrinsic rewards as opposed to the short – term goals and extrinsic rewards, which transactional leaders generally focus on. In addition, transactional leaders generally appeal to lower order needs such as personal security and self-interest, whereas transformational leaders appeal to *higher order needs* such values, aspirations and satisfaction. Unlike the transactional leader – the transformational leader is instrumental in *changing the values and goals of employees*. In doing so, followers are induced to *transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the organisation*. Furthermore, the transformational leader *challenges the status quo or organisational culture* in order to achieve his vision as opposed to the transactional leader who works within the organisational culture. Bass (1985) views transactional leaders as relying on legitimate power and respect for rules and tradition, while transformational leaders rely on *personal power and inspiration*.

The exchange relationship between transactional leaders and their followers is based on a contract that involves positive reinforcement for a higher level of performance. Emphasis is on facilitating the achievement of objectives agreed to by followers, similar to Path-Goal Theory (Bass & Avolio, 1999). In other words, transactional leaders recognise followers needs and desires to clarify how those needs and desires will be met in exchange for the work role. As such, employees are not expected to go beyond their initial expectations. Often, their performance is monitored based on standards and the transactional leader tends to intervene in the employees work processes, only when their performance deviates from the standard. Followers are extrinsically motivated to perform their job under the transactional leader (Amabile, cited in Robbins, 2001).

According to Burns (1978) transforming leadership embraces a mutually supportive relationship of moral and motivational engagement between leaders and followers, where power bases become linked in the continuing and enduring pursuit of common and higher purposes. Burns, means continuing change that is transformational in nature. Such changes would embrace material, cultural, institutional and psychological dimensions. In the process,

the transforming leader engages others by recognising and exploiting their needs and demands in such a way that the needs of both followers and leaders are satisfied. The result is a *collective act*, a relationship of *mutual stimulation* and elevation that converts followers into leaders (Burns, 1978). Yukl (1991) asserts that such transformational leadership *empowers employees* to take part or be involved in the process of reforming or transforming the organisation. In a similar way, Burke (cited in Robbins, 2001) states that leaders empower employees by emphasising a higher purpose or worthy cause.

The similarity between the two leadership styles is that both transactional and transformational leaders use the Expectancy Theory of Motivation, in that they identify the order the sequence of events to accomplish desired results. In this way, transformational leaders make followers more aware of the value of task outcomes than the transactional leader by appealing to higher order needs of the employees. Saunders (2000) is sceptical of western leadership theories in South Africa. In theory she agrees with transformational leadership as an appropriate style of leadership however she contends that the desired levels of trust and respect between groups needed for this type of leadership to be effective, does not exist in South Africa yet. Consequently, Saunders suggests the need for future development of a unique style of leadership for South African organisations, which is concerned with a unique set of special needs and challenges.

The current research will therefore aim to examine the relationship between transformational leadership, measured using theoretical scales of *individualised-consideration*, *intellectual stimulation*, *inspiration* and *charisma*. Transactional leadership is measured using theoretical scales of *contingent reward*, *management by exception (active)*, *management by exception (passive)* and Laissez-Faire or non-leadership, will also be measured. In addition, the effect of gender differences will also be correlated as having an effect in determining a specific type of leadership style. Therefore, the following sections will examine and provide clarification on the personality and demographic attributes which may affect the demonstration of a specific leadership style. In light of this, the current research adopts an interactional and situational perspective, which assumes that leaders' work settings, personality attributes and environments, contribute toward their related leadership styles. Furthermore, a leader's sense-of-self, competence level and achievement at work, also referred to as personal self-efficacy levels in the study will be studied. In addition, the leaders sense of coherence levels, which

encompasses levels of manageability, comprehensibility and meaningfulness will be evaluated and thirdly locus of control levels, are assessed.

Before examining the specific variables and their relevance to leadership styles however, it is necessary to clarify the manner in which situational variables will be defined and conceptualised in the current research.

## **2.5 DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF GENDER**

In the present study, the demographic differences of gender influencing transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles will only be examined briefly. Whether gender differences between males and females behaving differently in leadership roles, is a much - debated question. Although there seems to be agreement that woman face more barriers to becoming leaders, more so in leader roles that are male-dominated, there is less agreement of actual behaviours, once woman have attained these leader roles (Eagly, 2000). This type of behaviour will be interpreted as leadership styles for the purposes of this study, when style is understood as being relatively stable patterns of behaviour, as manifested by leaders. To analyse the gender differences it is necessary to first analyse traditional thinking about leadership styles of woman and men. Furthermore, a theoretical framework will be discussed in brief to interpret and examine the research findings in the following chapters.

Despite much focus on woman's leadership, which according to Thrall (cited in Robbins, 2001) be, "that issues of style with respect to woman, being unfortunately more important than issues of substance," there seems to be little agreement about how woman actually lead. In previous research, writers have claimed that the leadership styles of woman and men are different, along the lines of women being less hierarchical, more co operative and collaborative, and more orientated to enhancing others sense of self-worth (Helgesen & Rosener, cited in Goodwin, 2001). These characteristics and behaviours are described in the previous section as indicative of 'transformational' leaders.

In agreement with this statement, studies conducted by Ross and Offermann (cited in Robbins, 2001), demonstrated that high scores of transformational leadership were associated with a pattern of personality which included high levels of nurturance, female attributes and self-confidence and low levels of aggressiveness and critical behaviour. However, a

shortcoming in this 1977 study failed to measure the personality attributes of transactional leaders and how these differences explain an employee or unit's performance or underperformance. A further interesting finding was then made by Ross and Offermann's study, which was that the personality attributes correlated with transformational leadership as qualities associated with females' role in society as being: "a less aggressive and more nurturing leader." This is consistent with findings suggesting that female managers are more transformational than their male counterparts. However, as noted by Bass, there is a need for further research to determine whether the true gender differences are responsible for these findings or whether these results may be attributed to differences in competencies between males and females. In other words, implying that females have to strive harder than their male counterparts to reach the same positions as their male counterparts.

It has only been in recent findings in the 1990's that significant differences in leadership behaviour have begun to emerge. The MLQ questionnaire, adopted by Judy Rosener (cited in Robbins, 2001) found that a survey she conducted using male and female executives, revealed significant gender differences. These results indicated woman scoring higher on the use of transformational behaviours (apart from intellectual stimulation, which showed no significant differences), than their male counterparts. According to Alimo - Metcalfe and Alimo - Metcalfe (2000), a possible reason for this lack of gender differences in previous research is due to the fact that leadership instruments designed prior to the MLQ had only measured transactional aspects of leadership. Rosener's research attracted criticism regarding the validity of her findings, which was due to the fact that the data collected was based on a self-report of leadership styles. This criticism is valid however it is also important to examine the findings of the differences the study revealed; namely that: evidence of gender differences in notions of what is perceived as desirable leadership characteristics and how one should lead.

This theoretical rationale for gender differences and similarities in leadership styles may be compared to those findings discussed previously in the Ohio and Michigan studies of leadership. Both studies discuss finding specific leadership behaviours and attributes, which affect leadership effectiveness. Thus, analysis of situations where men and woman face differences as leaders, provides a rationale for expecting differences and similarities. According to social role theory of gender differences (Eagly, 2000), this analysis begins with the perspective that leadership roles, as do other leadership roles, are but one influence on

leadership behaviour or styles. Furthermore, leaders also elicit expectancies based on people's categorisation of them as male and female. These expectancies constitute the gender roles, which are the shared beliefs that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified sex. These roles, according to Eagley (2001), are assumed to follow from perceived observations of men and woman in their different social roles.

For the purposes of this study, a brief overview of gender differences will suffice as the study focuses mainly on the influence of the constructs sense of coherence, self-efficacy and locus of control in leadership styles. There is however a brief explanation of the demographic variable of gender in the results section which was apparent in the present study.

## **2.6 THE SALUTOGENIC AND FORTIGENIC PARADIGM**

Strümpfer and Mlonzi (2001) mention that since a large proportion of humanity spend most of their life at work, the world of work provides important endpoints of well-being. Strümpfer (1995) mentions further that salutogenesis points to the broad paradigm, which investigates the human's ability to manage stress, staying healthy and achieving optimality amidst a variety of stressors. This theory which was originally introduced by Aaron Antonovsky, was cited that the majority of medical studies excluded the examination of factors which cause some individuals to remain healthy, even when confronted by omnipresent stressors (Ortlepp & Friedman, cited in Robbins, 2001).

Antonovsky (1993, p. 728) cites that, "...in the very nature of human existence, stressors are omnipresent. Yet many people, even with a high stress load survive and even do well". Antonovsky states further that this is the mystery that salutogenesis seeks to unravel. The term salutogenesis is meant to emphasise health promotion and disease prevention rather than the pathogenic origins of the disease (Antonovsky, 1996). The salutogenic orientation proposes that "...we all are, so long there is breath of life in us, in some measure healthy" and that all people, at any time can therefore, be placed on a health-ease/disease continuum (Antonovsky, 1979).

Salutogenesis refers to the "origins of health", whilst fortigenesis, which is an expansion of the salutogenesis construct and goes beyond the normal concerns of health, refers to the "origins of strength". Thus, from a fortigenic orientation, it is necessary to consider the

origins of strength when researching psychological well-being of leaders. Antonovsky (1979) is of the opinion that individuals develop 'generalised resistance resources' (GRR's) through life experiences, which are defined as any individual characteristic, which facilitates the avoidance or combat of a wide variety of stressors. A feedback loop exists between GRR's and the salutogenic personality constructs, depending on previous experiences of overcoming stressors. Although the salutogenic orientation originally included only Antonovsky's sense of coherence concept, various other constructs have since become to be considered as salutogenic strengths. Strümpfer (1990) identifies six constructs that are considered to be salutogenic strengths, namely the sense of coherence (Antonovsky, 1979), hardiness, locus of control, self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), potency and learned resourcefulness. For the purpose of this study and considering the limited scope of this study, only sense of coherence, self-efficacy and locus of control were selected. A discussion of each of these constructs follows.

### **2.6.1 Conceptualisation of Sense of Coherence, Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control**

The outline for the following section centres around the argument that sense of coherence, self efficacy and locus of control have an influence and are influenced by certain leadership styles. Failing to include the above mediators ignores a large area of influential factors influencing a specific leadership style. Thus, to be effective, organisational practices need to 'enhance' tasks, work situations, rewards and behaviours to improve individual performance and the demonstration of certain leadership styles. The three constructs will be explained and defined in detail and their effect on leadership styles discussed.

### **2.6.2 Sense of Coherence**

Strümpfer and Mlonzi (2001) explain that sense of coherence is a key concept of Antonovsky's theoretical model of salutogenesis. In the opinion of Antonovsky (1993), if he were to recapitulate the most important consequence of the salutogenic orientation, he would conclude that, salutogenic thinking opens the way and compels us to devote our energies to the formulation and advance a theory of coping. This, in due course, led Antonovsky towards formulating the concept sense of coherence.

The salutogenic theory suggests that individuals have access to a variety of resistance resources, so as to enable them to cope with stress-producing experiences. A person, who

experiences frequent availability of these resources during their personal development, develops a strong sense of coherence.

#### **2.6.2.1 Conceptualising sense of coherence**

Sense of Coherence expresses an individual's global orientation to life (Feldt & Rasku, 1998). Sense of Coherence expresses the extent to which one has an enduring, dynamic feeling of confidence that the (i) stimuli from one's internal and external environments are structured, predictable and explicable; and (ii) resources are available to meet the demands posed by the stimuli and (iii) these demands are viewed as challenges, worthy of investment (Antonovsky, 1979). The author states further that the first of the above aspects of sense of coherence is termed comprehensibility (cognitive component), the second is termed manageability (instrumental component) and the third is meaningfulness (motivational component). These three components are interrelated and individuals scoring high on comprehensibility, manageability and meaningfulness, view the environment in a coherent way. Alternatively individuals scoring low on the component, view the environment as incoherent.

A sense of meaningfulness is a central theme of sense of coherence due to its motivational element. This is evident in research where the leader displays a high level of comprehensibility and manageability. Someone who is in control and believes that the resources are available to him/her to deploy successfully (Antonovsky, 1979). Should the sense of meaningfulness be weak, an understanding with others and the environment is lost and the command of available resources is lost. In the work, as in other life contexts, consistent experiences help provide a basis for comprehensibility, a good-load balance for manageability, and participation in decision-making for meaningfulness (Antonovsky, 1996). Thus, influence at work is essential to an individual's sense of meaningfulness. Furthermore, taking part in collective decision-making strengthens an individual's manageability, because perceived social resources, such as the support and advice of colleagues or managers, have an important instrumental function to an individual.

In addition, comprehensibility at work is strengthened considerably when the work environment enables an employee to see the entire spectrum and his or her place in it, fosters confidence and feelings of security, and supports communicability in social relations

(Antonovsky, 1996). It has been found for example that a strong SOC is negatively associated with perceived work stress (Ryland & Greenfeld, cited in Robbins, 2001), emotional exhaustion at work (Feldt, 1997) and burnout (Barker, 2001) and positively associated with life satisfaction (Antonovsky, 1993), general well-being (Ryland & Greenfeld, cited in Robbins), functional status (Carmel, cited in Robbins); and psychological and physical well-being. Furthermore, a weak SOC has been found to be associated with depression (Bowman, cited in Robbins, 2001) and anxiety (Carmel & Bernstein, cited in Robbins).

Although SOC has been stated to be a relatively stable health resource in adulthood, Antonovsky (1996) stresses that SOC is not rigidly fixed, but on the contrary, may fluctuate around a mean level of SOC. For example, radical and major changes in working conditions may change the strength of SOC (Antonovsky). Such modifications, can have an effect on the individuals health fate (Antonovsky). In research studies it is indicated that those whose work offers better psychosocial working conditions enjoy stronger SOC and as a result better occupational and social well being. It may also be assumed that when an employee encounters changes in his or her working environment, his or her SOC weakens, which, in turn, reduces well-being, and, vice versa, when an employee experiences positive changes in his or her working environment, his or her SOC strengthens, which in turn increases well-being.

In a one-year follow up study; the mediator role of SOC between certain psychosocial work characteristics, i.e. influence at work, leadership relations, organisational climate, results revealed that perceived changes in organisational climate and leadership were related to changes in SOC. The results thus indicated the importance of organisational climate on promoting SOC.

#### **2.6.2.2 Research results on sense of coherence**

In defining the above construct it is important to define the empirical research which describes the hypotheses of sense of coherence's influence on transactional and transformational leadership styles. The literature refers to employees having a high or low identification on perceptions and reactions to organisational identification. This employee perception, in turn may be assumed to affect a leader's sense of coherence self-efficacy, and locus of control. This is evident whereby people low in organisational identification tend not

to be committed to the organisation, are low in motivation, and are likely to work closely to the work contract.

Regarding sense of coherence, the literature research reveals that a leader's sense of coherence may be linked to job satisfaction and motivation levels and the ability to cope with levels of stress. It may thus be assumed from the literature that a leader with a high sense of coherence reflects a positive job satisfaction level, and adequate stress coping mechanism when faced with changes in the workplace. This may also be deduced from employees experiencing similar levels of job satisfaction and well-being. In studies conducted by Martin (cited in Robbins, 2001) employees with a high organisational identification were more likely to internalise the organisational values and beliefs and in doing so, actively monitored their work environment and showed more motivation. On the contrary, people with low organisational identity tend to not be committed to the organisation, are low in motivation and thus reflect a poor sense of coherence in their leader. This study will attempt to define the level of sense of coherence in the different leadership styles.

Rothmann (2000) found a positive correlation between sense of coherence and generalised self-efficacy. Rothmann also found a positive correlation between sense of coherence and self-efficacy.

## **2.7 GENERALISED SELF-EFFICACY**

Bandura maintains that knowledge and ability are poor predictors of performance and that individuals attitudes with regard to their own ability, have a strong influence on the outcome of their behaviour (Wood & Bandura, cited in Robbins, 2001).

### **2.7.1 Conceptualising self-efficacy**

Self-efficacy is an estimate of one's ability to orchestrate performance through successfully executing behaviours that are required to produce desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). In other words, self-efficacy is the individual's belief that he or she is capable of performing a task. The higher your self-efficacy, the more confident the individual in their own ability to complete tasks effectively. Thus individuals with high self-efficacy will tend to master tasks whereas those with low self-efficacy will tend to give up. In addition, Robbins (2001) claims

that individuals high in self-efficacy will respond to negative feedback with increased effort and determination as opposed to those with low self-efficacy levels. For the purposes of this research, leaders with a higher self-efficacy will be more effective as leaders and have followers that are more committed and performance orientated.

According to theory and research conducted by Bandura (1997), self-efficacy results in differences in how individuals think and act. A low sense of self-efficacy results in low self-esteem and may be associated with anxiety, depression and a sense of helplessness. A strong sense of self-efficacy facilitates cognitive processing and enhanced performance, achievement and decision-making effectiveness (Schwarzer & Mueller, 1999). Individuals with high self-efficacy choose to perform tasks, which are more challenging (Bandura). They set themselves higher goals and tend to stick to them. Actions are pre determined and activities are either enacted positively or pessimistically, in line with their level of self-efficacy. High self-efficacious people seem to invest more effort in tasks and tend to persist longer than those with a low sense of self-efficacy. When setbacks or deviations occur, high self-efficacious individuals recover more quickly and maintain commitment to their goals. It has been researched that higher self-efficacy relates to improved health, higher achievement and greater social integration.

### **2.7.2 The core dimensions of self-efficacy**

As is the case with sense of coherence, three dimensions of self-efficacy have been identified; namely magnitude, strength and generality. Appelbaum and Hare (1996) explain these concepts as follows.

- Magnitude refers to the level of task difficulty an individual believes he/she can attain.
- Strength refers to the degree of conviction an individual holds that he/she can attain a given level of task performance.
- Generality applies, to the extent that a given self-efficacy judgement applies over a variety of situations.

### **2.7.3 The development of self-efficacy beliefs**

Wood and Bandura (cited in Robbins, 2001) identify four key sources of self-efficacy beliefs, these being enactive mastery experiences, modelling, social persuasion and psychological states.

Enactive mastery experiences refer to strengthening of self-efficacy as a consequence of task accomplishment and within the triadic reciprocal causation model, are associated with the influence of behaviour on self-efficacy beliefs. Appelbaum and Hare (1996) are of the opinion, that the strengthening or weakening of self-efficacy beliefs through task experienced by a person in his position. These researchers note that task conditions can be adjusted to facilitate that success.

Modelling also known as vicarious experience, is principally associated with environmental influences. Modelling refers to the observation of another person, where the model, through successful efforts, conveys to the observing persons possible task strategies, a basis for social comparison, judgement of their own abilities and encouragement to believe that success is possible. Appelbaum and Hare (1996) note that the desire to imitate models, first manifests in childhood when children imitate adults and siblings. In an organisational setting, a desire to imitate superiors or good performers, may be strong in some people.

Social (verbal) persuasion, although not as strong as enactive mastery or modelling, is also an important environmental source of self-efficacy beliefs. Social persuasion can be viewed as a normal form of encouragement.

Lastly, an individuals perception of his/her psychological state, influences that person's judgement of self-efficacy. Anxiety, tension, fatigue or pain will negatively affect self-efficacy judgements. According to Appelbaum and Hare (1996), efforts to improve either physical or psychological states, through attempts to reduce stress or improve physical conditions, can be considered as mechanisms to improve self-efficacy judgements.

#### **2.7.4 The behavioural implications of self-efficacy**

Paglis (2002) found that a high self-efficacy influences behaviour in the following four ways.

- It influences the choice of behaviour. Individuals avoid tasks at which they do not feel competent and rather prefer tasks that they are confident they can perform successfully.

- Individuals' perception of self-efficacy will influence how many attempts they will make and how long they will persevere.
- Thought patterns and emotional responses are also affected by self-efficacy. A person with a low self-efficacy, may believe that things are more difficult than they really are, whereas a person with high self-efficacy, will persist despite obstacles and view failures as temporary setbacks.
- Self-efficacy affects the amount of task-related stress and anxiety that a person experiences. Self-confidence promotes success, which in turn promotes more challenging performances. Self-doubt leads to hesitation and failure to try again.

### **2.7.5 Research results on self-efficacy**

According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy makes a difference to how people think, feel and act. Self-efficacy facilitates cognitive processes and performance in a variety of settings. A low self-efficacy is associated with depression, anxiety and helplessness. Such individuals also have a low self-esteem and harbour pessimistic thoughts about their accomplishments and personal development.

Self-Efficacy is also commonly understood to be domain-specific, which implies that an individual may have firm beliefs in different domains or specific situations of functioning. General self-efficacy as stated by Schwarzer (2001), is aimed at a broad sense of personal competence to deal effectively with a variety of stressful situations.

Bandura (1997) claims that the development of self-efficacy is developed through learning and modelling of behaviours. Most modelling is based on observation and instructional learning. This method of modelling utilises self-instructional thoughts to guide performance (Gist, cited in Appelbaum & Hare, 1996). Research results have also attested to having a positive influence of self-efficacy perceptions on performance. Several studies have shown that leadership behaviours affect perceptions of self-efficacy. These studies focused on external leadership, self-leadership and self management on self-efficacy in different tasks and domains. Schwarzer (1999) found that leader behaviours, task setting and goal setting, positively influenced self-efficacy expectations. Sherer et al. (cited in Robbins, 2001) found

similar results in the influence of an entrepreneurial (leadership role), significantly affected subjects level of self-efficacy.

Furthermore, Frayne and Latham (cited in Robbins, 2001), found self-management techniques, positively influenced self-efficacy. The findings thus showed that research supports the positive effects of self-management on self-efficacy. Efficacy perceptions are enhanced when individuals are in a position to experience confidence through greater self-control. Research shows further that particular leadership behaviours affect self-efficacy perceptions. According to research studies, it may be concluded that the use of self-leadership strategies influence self-efficacy perceptions for a specific task. Thus, it may be assumed that self-leadership strategies have a direct, positive effect on the level of self-efficacy (Prussia, Anderson & Manz, 1998). Furthermore researchers have linked self-efficacy to improved attendance behaviour, increased task behaviour and academic achievement (Multon, Brent & Lent, cited in Robbins, 2001). Thus it may also be proposed that self-efficacy has a direct, positive effect on leadership performance.

Self-leadership → self-efficacy → performance

Self-efficacy results from the acquisition of cognitive, social, linguistic and physical skills through personal and/or vicarious experience (Bandura, 1986). Individuals evaluate this information about their task abilities and make decisions about choice of action, level of effort, and duration of persistence for subsequent task activities (Bandura). In contrast, self-leadership represents a constellation of behaviours, attitudes and cognitions, which represent a less specific orientation. Previous research examined the mediating influences of self-efficacy in a variety of task domains and found that self-efficacy fully mediates the relation between self-leadership and performance.

An individual's self-efficacy influences the activities that he or she chooses to engage in. People approach and explore situations within their perceived capabilities, while avoiding situations within their perceived capabilities and avoiding situations they think exceed their ability (Bandura, 1997). Research has further indicated that the greater confidence individuals have in their capabilities, the more vigorous their effort and persistence (Bandura, 1986). Schwarzer (1999) found that leader behaviours that supported constructive problem solving and group member's self-efficacy resulted in higher employee creativity.

Rothmann (2000) found a negative correlation between self-efficacy and external locus of control, implying that a person with a low self-efficacy, will lean toward an external locus of control. A person who views achievements as being beyond their control, will show less of a tendency to believe in their own ability, to act with self-confidence and to make decisions and take actions which lead to problem solving. Gist (cited in Appelbaum & Hare, 1996) is of the opinion, that perceived locus of control are likely to require less enactive mastery experiences to develop a strong sense of self-efficacy and respond better to modelling than do their counterparts.

According to Rothmann (2000), literature provides substantial amounts of research linking self-efficacy and locus of control. According to Rotter (cited in Rothmann), individuals with an external locus of control, tend to doubt their personal self-efficacy and both self-efficacy and locus of control are cognitive constructs that are related to control. Self-efficacy pertains to confidence with respect to actions or behaviour, whereas locus of control is more concerned with confidence in being able to control outcomes (Judge, cited in Rothmann).

#### **2.7.6 Self-efficacy and leadership styles**

A transformational leader seeks to transform the follower's personal values and self-concepts so that they can broaden and elevate their needs and aspirations to focus and achieve higher levels of needs and potential (Bass & Avolio, 1999). According to Gardner and Pierce (1998) this high level of value alignment is what makes the impact that transformational leaders have on employees' intrinsic motivation stronger than other leadership styles. Kirkpatrick and Locke (cited in Robbins, 2001) tested a model suggesting that goal level and follower self-efficacy mediate the effects of transformational leadership behaviour on performance. They reported significant correlations among the vision of quality, quality goal, self-efficacy and performance goal. Thus, goal level and self-efficacy function as moderators, rather than mediators of the relationship between leader behaviour.

Low identifiers of self-efficacy, may, indeed be highly motivated but would be more concerned with advancing their own self-interests rather than the collective good of their own work group or organisation (Haslam, cited in Robbins, 2001). For these individuals one would expect them to be more responsive to transactional than to transformational leadership

(because many of their work needs are met by exchange relationships). On the other hand, people high in organisational identification tend to be committed and motivated in their work and therefore one would expect them to be more responsive to transformational leadership (as this would allow them to realise their goals and ambitions).

High identifiers of self-efficacy would respond favourably to a leader who promotes the general collective good of the group and organisations with this identity would lead to a positive individual identity and in turn, improved social identity. It is possible then to hypothesise that employees with a high sense of self-efficacy respond and align themselves with leaders who also have a high sense of self-efficacy, which is displayed by transformational leaders. In contrast then, those with a low sense of social identity and self-efficacy respond to leaders with a low self-efficacy, characterised by transactional leaders. Self-efficacy thus has an influence and impact on the leadership style.

In research conducted by Lord (cited in Robbins, 2001) the self-concept, (known as self-efficacy) for the purposes of this research, is integrated into leadership style research. This is also made evident according to Lord, whereby transactional leadership is most effective when the subordinates sense of self is defined at an individual level and transformational leadership being most effective when the subordinates sense of self is defined at the collective or group level.

Furthermore, transformational leadership accounts for psychological reactions to employee's work and performance level. This is also evident where it has been previously stated that individuals with a high external locus of control do not believe that success or failure is related to ability or effort but rather to a directive leadership style (transactional style) of others to influence them (Kren, cited in Robbins, 2001). Conversely, individuals with a high locus of control believe that success results from hard work and that failure is an individual responsibility. In general, internals are more likely to have a greater aspiration than externals for personal control in the work context. The hypothesis to be tested is that transactional leaders exhibit a low locus of control and transformational leaders exhibit a high internal locus of control.

Thus effective leaders are skilled *tacticians* who are able to adjust their behaviors to individual group members and they do this based upon their naïve notions of what people

want from the workplace and how they think they would respond to different leadership behaviors. While all effective leadership relationships need transactional behaviors, the skilled tactician directs his or her transformational behaviors to those he or she believes are most worthy and/or receptive to them. Since leaders perceive those low in organisational identification are not highly committed to the work, they judge that transactional behaviors are sufficient and direct their transformational behaviors to those who they perceive are more committed, namely those high in organisational identification.

## **2.8 LOCUS OF CONTROL**

Literature indicates that the concept of locus of control stems from the attribution theory and the social learning theory.

### **2.8.1 The Attribution Theory**

Bothma and Schepers (1997) note, that although the attribution theory originates from the work of cognitive theorists, the founder is generally recognised as Fritz Heider. Heider (cited in Bothma & Schepers) argued, that it is perception rather than actual causation that is an important determinant in behaviour. According to Coetzer and Schepers (cited in Bothma & Schepers), the attribution theory relates to the manner in which individuals apply information from their environment in order to offer causal explanations for events. According to Heider (cited in Bothma & Schepers), the attribution theory focuses on the relationship between person-perception and internal behaviour and is based on the following three assumptions.

- Individuals attempt to determine the causes of behaviour
- Individuals describe the causative explanations of behaviour in a systematic manner.
- Individual attributions influence individuals' future behaviour.

### **2.8.2 The Social Learning theory**

Social learning theorists (Rotter, cited in Rothmann, 2000; Bandura, 1986) are of the opinion that behaviour is the result of interaction between the characteristics of the individual and characteristics of the situation. Such interaction presents the opportunity for self-

development, but within established boundaries. According to Bandura the foundation of the social-cognitive learning theory 's view of human nature, is reciprocal determinism. Plug, Louw, Gouws and Meyer (1997) define pure determinism as any viewpoint that denies freedom of will and which suggests that human behaviour is determined by influences outside of their own control. Meyer, Moore and Viljoen (cited in Saunders, 2000) interpret human behaviour in the context of reciprocal determinism as its being the result of, and part of, a continuous process where the individual, the individuals behaviour and the situation, jointly influence one another. Individuals are thus able to determine their own behaviour and development, but are influenced by environmental factors, as well as their own behaviour.

According to Rotter (cited in Rothmann, 2000), human behaviour can be clarified in terms of the suggestion, that behaviour is largely determined by environmental influences, that genetic factors play only a minor role in determining behaviour and that behaviour can be explained in term so of classical and instrumental conditioning, observation and experiential learning, symbolic processes (for example, expectations) and self-regulating processes (for example, planning).

The social learning theory suggests that the reinforcement of behaviour leads to the expectation, that the specific behaviour or event will lead to that reinforcement in future (Coetzer & Schepers, cited in Bothma & Schepers, 1997). Rotter (cited in Rothmann, 2000) and Bandura (1986) hypothesise that individuals develop interpretations of their own behaviour, which the researchers coin as internal or external loci of control. Rotter developed locus of control as a construct and personality variable, which denotes the degree to which individuals perceive that they control or are controlled by their environment. It is further indicated, that a persons locus of control orientation is the sole determinant of the cause of behaviour. Other personality factors, established by reciprocal determinants, also play a role in the causation of behaviour.

### **2.8.3 Conceptualising locus of control**

Locus of control is an individuals' belief of the relationship between the environment and the individual (Spector, 1982). In the literature, a distinction is formulated between those individuals who have an internal locus of control (internals) and those who have an external locus of control (externals). In other words, internals are people who believe that they control

their destinies whereas externals believe their lives are controlled by outside forces. A person's perception of his or her own fate is labelled 'locus of control'.

Locus of control thus refers to a stable personality trait that describes the extent to which people attribute the cause or control of events to themselves, (internal orientation) or to the external environmental factors such as fate or luck (Kren, cited in Robbins, 2001; Rotter, cited in Rothmann, 2000). From this distinction it appears that individuals have different beliefs about the factors responsible for what happens to them. Research comparing internals with externals have shown that individuals scoring higher in externalities are less satisfied with their jobs, have increased absenteeism and are more alienated from their work and less involved in their jobs than internals.

Internals believe that success results from hard work, that failure is an individual responsibility; and are more likely to occupy *managerial positions*. Conversely, externals do not believe that success or failure is related to ability or effort (Kren, cited in Robbins, 2001), they are more likely to accept efforts by others to influence them (Anderson, cited in Robbins), and respond more positively to a *directive leadership style*. In addition, externals fail to acknowledge or expect that their own actions will lead to the attainment of rewards or the avoidance of punishment (Spector, 1982). Further, internals are inclined towards finding ways to cope with stress, whereas externals are more likely to accept stressful conditions rather than attempt to cope with them. In general, internals are more likely to have a greater aspiration than externals for personal control in the work context and at the same time are more likely to find ways of overcoming stress.

Regarding the research topic, it may then be assumed that transformational leadership styles may be linked to internals or individuals who are already in a managerial capacity, having a high internal locus of control. Contrary to the above statement, the opposite may then be valid for individuals who are in a managerial capacity, having high externals, having a low locus of control. In effect, this type of leadership style renders leaders more effective in their leadership behaviour and goal accomplishment.

Mitchell, Smyser and Weed (cited in Robbins, 2001), for example in a field study of public utility employees, found internals to have a higher expectancy and higher instrumentality than externals when evaluating between their actions and subsequent outcomes. Mitchell et

al. (cited in Robbins) concluded that expectancy was higher because internals see their efforts more closely related to performance, and instrumentality was higher because internals see a stronger relationship between performance evaluations and rewards. In addition, internals also perceived that they had more control over their time than externals.

#### **2.8.4 Research results on the locus of control**

According to Judge (cited in Rothmann, 2000) individuals with an internal locus of control will probably feel that they can manage situations in the work context because these situations are seen as being within their personal control. Spector (1982) found that high levels of perceived control were associated with high levels of job satisfaction, commitment and involvement and low levels of stress, absenteeism and turnover. The research of Le Roux, Schmidt and Schepers (cited in Robbins, 2001) established a positive correlation between internal locus of control and achievement motivation. According to Spector, internals will be less inclined than externals to manage their frustrations within organisations by withdrawing or reacting aggressively.

In exploring the relationship between locus of control and leadership styles, this thesis focuses on leadership as one of the criteria variables of interest. As mentioned, it is perceived that internals display greater leadership than would externals because they perceive themselves to have greater control of themselves and the work environment (Amabile, cited in Robbins, 2001). This does not imply that externals are less orientated toward personal goals but rather that internals will exert greater efforts toward acquiring personal goals because they are more likely to believe that their efforts will be successful. In certain work contexts the internals will exhibit more task-orientated, goal-orientated and coping behaviour, and as a result demonstrate greater leadership demonstration (Spector, 1982).

Despite the evidence confirming that internals will be more likely to demonstrate greater leadership behaviours than externals do, there are certain situations where the above-mentioned internal, external settings will not be demonstrated. First, job-settings in which the job is highly structured (i.e. low job autonomy) will not show the internal-external differences (Deci & Ryan, cited in Feldt & Rasku, 1998). As mentioned, internals are sensitive to the job context, and when internals feel that the job is not allowing autonomy, it could lower their leadership behaviours. In contrast externals might be more inclined toward

accepting a very structured job (Ivancevich & Matteson, cited in Robbins, 2001), where jobs are failing to provide autonomy, as they might feel that this type of situation is consistent with their belief that others control events in their lives. This awareness that the job is providing the external supervision or structure would therefore enhance their leadership behaviours (Kren, cited in Robbins, 2001). Kimmons and Greenhaus (cited in Smith & Dugan, 1995) provide support for both these contentions. In a field study using a sample of 216 managers, internals who reported having more autonomy were more motivated than externals and thus described as having more leadership attributes and behaviours.

Another situation where the internal-external difference will not be straightforward, is a situation in which the specifications of the activities or tasks a person is expected to perform on a regular basis, is unclear or ambiguous. Externals' inclination towards accepting control suggests that they would find an environment, which provides structure and influence by the role senders as motivating. Thus, these individuals would not be motivated and display leadership behaviours, in an environment where there is no direction and supervision from relevant role senders (ambiguity). By contrast, internals are generally less receptive to attempts at control. According to Anderson (cited in Robbins, 2001), internals tend to resist attempts by others to influence them. Therefore, internals would need less supervision from the relevant role senders than externals and may even perceive the exercising of control as unnecessary and unwanted. Accordingly they would experience more leadership in a situation where the relevant role sender was not exerting a large amount of influence on them.

The third situation where the internal-external difference will not be demonstrated is in work contexts where rewards do not follow performance. According to Rotter (cited in Rothmann, 2000), the response to reinforcement or reward is determined to a large extent, by the degree to which reward is perceived to be contingent on actions. Internals perceive a greater relationship between their own actions and subsequent outcomes. Therefore they are more likely to respond to rewards since they believe their own efforts will be adequate to secure a reward. As internals are more sensitive to reinforcement contingencies, when effort on the job does not lead to reward internals may adopt a more external perspective (Spector, 1982).

A similar conclusion may be reached within the structure of the expectancy model of motivation. According to Vroom and Yetton (1973), there are two classes of expectancies: 1) that effort will lead to good job performance and 2) that good performance will lead to

rewards. The former expectancy is related to an individual's belief in his/her own competence (Kren, cited in Robbins, 2001). More specifically, the individual believes that he/she can perform well if they make the effort. The latter is related to the belief that good performance is rewarded (Spector, 1982). If an individual scores high on both expectancies he/she will have high job motivation and leadership styles and will perform well. However, this will depend on the limits of his/her ability and organisational constraints (Spector, 1988). It might be expected that internals will have higher expectancies with regard to both forms of beliefs than externals would. Their expectancies are higher because internals view their efforts more closely related to performance and because internals see a stronger relationship between performance and evaluations and work related rewards (Hollenbeck & Brief, cited in Smith & Dugan, 1995). These results suggest that the internal-external differences in motivation and leadership attributes, will only be found if incentives are closely linked to performance.

This is consistent with the research conducted by Kren (cited in Robbins, 2001). Using a sample of 44 students it was found that locus of control interacted with incentives. Specifically, the presence of incentives motivated greater efforts for internals, but when the incentive was absent, the internal groups effort was less than the external groups effort.

The aforementioned findings lend support to the current research in that locus of control has the potential to moderate the relationship between situational characteristics and leadership styles. More specifically the current research will test the manner in which internals or externals exposed to the same organisational context perceive that context and how this, in turn, affects leadership styles. The current study will therefore focus upon the combined effects of locus of control, sense of coherence and self-efficacy on leadership styles.

Brockner (cited in Smith & Dugan, 1995) notes that while it is possible for a low self-esteem individual to have high self-efficacy for a given task, in general, those higher in self-esteem have more positive beliefs about their abilities than do people with low self-esteem. Likewise, Gist (cited in Appelbaum & Hare, 1996) consider self-esteem as one determinant of self-efficacy. They note that people with low self-esteem are more likely to suffer anxiety in performance situations and tend to excessively focus on their perceived inadequacies. A low self-esteem manager, then, may feel more anxious and self-critical about his chances for success when confronting leadership opportunities, compared to his high self-esteem counterpart Paglis and Green (2002).

Rothmann (2000) found a positive correlation between sense of coherence and internal locus of control, indicating that individuals with a strong sense of coherence will attribute performance to causes within their own control. Rothmann obtained similar results, where a negative correlation was found between sense of coherence and external control.

Antonovsky draws the attention to the differences that exist in the conceptual definitions of sense of coherence and locus of control. In the context of sense of coherence, the resources under the control of others are also viewed as valuable, whereas locus of control views such resources as an external orientation and consequently, as a failure to take control of one's own destiny.

## **2.9 THE LEADERSHIP SITUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA**

South African organisations are faced with new challenges, opportunities, hopes and fears (Billings & Harris, cited in Saunders, 2000). Sociopolitical changes since 1991 have moved South Africa from a paternalistic to a democratic society, impacting on employee/manager/leader relations in organisations (Bass, 1999). Organisations are still plagued by elements of mistrust and conflict between management and labour (Saunders). The challenge facing leaders is to foster positive relationships, to focus on mutual interests and to develop co-operative relationships based on an understanding of employees needs. In addition, there is a need to 'reconstitute the psychological contract,' and to establish partnerships contracts based on integrity, trust, co-operation and legitimacy (Saunders). Thus there must be a move away from coercive power to referent power (Saunders).

Leaders need to be people with charisma and intellect, whereby they create new visions, have specific goals and clear values (Saunders, 2000). The importance of transformational leadership for organisational effectiveness has been well supported (Bass, 1999). Research conducted to support this statement shows reliable cross-sectional correlations between ratings of transformational leadership and a variety of work-related effectiveness measures, including increased work effort, work innovation, and organisational behaviour (Mackenzie & Bonmer, cited in Kreitner & Kinicki, 1999).

## **2.10 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In Chapter 2, the concept of leadership styles, as viewed by various researchers, is defined. Furthermore, an overview is provided of the precursors of leadership, the history and origin of leadership and the influence of the demographics of gender on leadership styles. This chapter provides a discussion of the salutogenic orientation and the concepts of sense of coherence, locus of control and generalised self-efficacy; and it is illustrated, that the three dependant variables applicable in this research, hold important implications for leader effectiveness and other key leadership issues.

In Chapter 3, which follows, the empirical study will be described in detail, providing reference to the research design, study population, measuring battery, approach to statistical analysis and research procedure.

The first specific objective, which is to conceptualise leadership styles, sense of coherence, self-efficacy and locus of control, as well as the relationship between these constructs from the literature, has been accomplished.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **EMPIRICAL STUDY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

In the previous chapter leadership styles, sense of coherence, self - efficacy and locus of control, as well as the relationship amongst these constructs, were conceptualised from the literature.

In this chapter the process used for the empirical research, will be discussed. The choice and composition of the research objectives, research design, study population, and measuring instruments, approach to the scoring and interpretation of the measuring instruments, as well as statistical analyses, will be conferred. Lastly, the research hypotheses will be formulated.

#### **3.2 THE OBJECTIVE OF THE EMPIRICAL STUDY**

The general objective of this research is to determine the relationship between leadership styles and psychological strengths (as measured by sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control) of leaders in an organisation. Furthermore the demographic variable of gender in terms of these constructs will also be compared, and it will be determined whether leadership styles can predict sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control.

##### **3.2.1 Empirical objectives**

The empirical objectives of this research are as follows;

- Determine transactional and transformational leadership styles, within an organisation.
- Determine the relationship between sense of coherence, self-efficacy, locus of control and transactional and transformational leadership within an organisation.
- Determine the levels of transactional and transformational leadership between the demographic variables.

- Determine whether leadership is influenced by sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control.
- Determine the relationships between leadership styles and sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control of leaders in an organisation.
- Determine whether leadership styles predict sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control.
- Determining the reliability and construct validity of the measuring instruments used in this study.

### **3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN**

A survey was designed to achieve the research objectives. The specific design used was the correlation design (Huysamen, 1993). This design can be used to assess interrelationships among variables at one point in time, without any planned intervention. This design is ideal when the aim of the study is predictive and descriptive by nature (Shaugnessy & Zechmeister, 1997). The advantage of using the above research design in this study is to gather as much information as possible, in a relatively short period; where a longitudinal design would be more cumbersome and labour intensive.

Due to the explorative nature of the research, the selected research design is also the most suited. The explorative nature of the study allows for an overview of the available literature and data, which is of relevance to this study and also to encourage further research in this area (Mouton & Marais, 1992).

### **3.4 STUDY POPULATION**

The study was conducted within a South African utility; electrical company utilising the total population of managers and supervisors within the company. The specific organisation is situated in the Gauteng region. By virtue of the fact that employees were working within this organisation, they were provided with the opportunity to partake in the research. The participants include supervisors and managers graded at various levels, ranging from the D lower level and higher on the Paterson grading scale. The job titles of participants were clustered into two, namely that of supervisory categories encompassing supervisors and the

second category labelled managers and encompassing; branch managers, general managers and regional managers within the organisation.

The participants were employees of an electrical wholesaling and manufacturing company ( $N = 216$ ). A total of 86 questionnaires were received back; however only 85 questionnaires could be used, as one was incorrectly completed. This results in a response rate of 39,8%. The characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1.

The study population consisted of Managers Supervisors within the organisation, who had followers reporting to them. The Managers and Supervisors were distributed geographically throughout the Northern, Eastern and Gauteng Region and included respondents in Namibia. Respondents were identified using a list of the entire population of managers and supervisors within the organisation, obtained from the Human Resources Department.

These participants consisted of a representative sample of employees from the company. In other words there was an adequate representation of all gender groups in the company (Kanfer & Hegestad, cited in Metcalfe & Metcalfe, 2000).

Table 1

*Demographic characteristics of the study population (n = 86)*

<i>Biographical details</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Number (N) of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	76	88,3
	Female	10	11,62
<b>Language</b>	English	58	67,44
	Afrikaans	16	18,60
	Sotho	2	2,32
	Tswana	5	5,81
	Zulu	2	2,32
	Other	3	3,48
<b>Age</b>	21-30 years	11	12,79
	31-40 years	21	24,41
	41-50 years	21	24,41
	51-60 years	23	26,7

	60 + years	9	10,46
	Other	1	1,16
<b>Educational level</b>	Std 6-9	21	24,41
	Std 10 / Matric	42	48,83
	Undergraduate degree	8	9,30
	Postgraduate degree	8	9,30
	Other	7	8,13
<b>Tenure</b>	Less than one year	1	1,16
	1 – 5 years	14	16,27
	6 – 10 years	26	30,23
	11 – 15 years	19	22,09
	More than 15 + years	26	30,23

From the exposition provided above, it can be seen that 76% of the study population are male, 67,4% are English speaking, 48,8% have a matric (grade twelve) whilst 9% have an undergraduate degree; 9% have a post-graduate degree; 30% have been working for the company for 6 to 10 years and 30% have also worked for the company for more than 15 years. In general, the research group appears to be biographically balanced, except that significantly more men than women participated in this study. Furthermore, the group appears to consist mainly of employees who have been working for this company for long periods of time, with only 16% having worked for this company for fewer than five years and the greater proportion having worked for this company in excess of 10 years, indicating stability.

### **3.5 THE MEASURING BATTERY**

In this section a discussion of the various measuring instruments follows. Reference will be provided to the rationale and development, description, administration, scoring, interpretation, validity and reliability of the respective measuring instruments.

### **3.6 RESEARCH PROCEDURE**

Each of the participants in the study was required to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire included a covering letter, detailing the purpose of the study and ensuring

respondents confidentiality, accompanied each questionnaire. Anonymity was ensured as subjects were not required to write their names on the questionnaire. This letter explained that the survey was of a voluntary nature and guaranteed respondents that no person in the organisation would have access to their individual responses. In addition to the covering letter, the questionnaire contained 5 sections which included the following:

Section A – Biographical questionnaire; Section B – The Leadership Questionnaire, Section C - The Sense of Coherence Scale; Section D – The Self Efficacy Scale; and Section E – The Work Locus of Control Scale

The respondents were requested to complete the questionnaire and return it, within three weeks, in a sealed envelope to ensure confidentiality. This particular questionnaire technique was employed as respondents were presumably under no pressure to respond immediately and may have felt more comfortable answering questions of a personal nature on a questionnaire, rather than an interview situation (Breakwell, Hammond & Fife-Shaw, cited in Kerlinger, 1998).

### **3.7 THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS**

The study was conducted by means of a number of self-report questionnaires. A self-report type questionnaire was chosen as it best fulfilled the task of probing into a given state of affairs (Huysamen, 1993), particularly the subjective perceptions of the situational variables. Questionnaires of this nature are more appropriate to use as they can be administered to a large number of people. In addition, questionnaires allow for anonymity, which is necessary and important when one is probing into a subject's personal state of affairs.

The following measuring instruments were used in the study:

#### **3.7.1. The Biographical Questionnaire**

A biographical questionnaire was designed to elicit information on the respondent's age, home language, gender, educational level, and years of tenure within the organisation. The aim of eliciting this information was to determine the extent to which the biographical information might contribute to any variance in the results.

### **3.7.2 The Multi-Factor Self-Assessment Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)**

The MLQ was used to measure participants' perceptions of their own leadership styles. The full range of leadership styles, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), implies that every leader displays a frequency of both transactional and transformational factors. Each leader's profile however involves more of one and less of the other. Those leaders more satisfying to their followers and who are more effective as leaders are more transformational and less transactional (Bass & Avolio, 1999). So too, members of transformational teams care more about each other, intellectually stimulate one another, inspire and identify with the team's goals, as opposed to transactional styles.

### **3.7.3 Development and rationale of the MLQ**

The Multi-Factor Leadership questionnaire is designed to identify the way a leader perceives their own transformational, transactional and laissez-faire (non-leadership) styles, according to these three categories. Leadership styles are important to measure as they affect follower commitment levels, attitudes, performance and success levels. Transformational leaders display behaviours associated with four transformational styles: *Idealized Behaviours*, *Inspirational Motivation*, *Intellectual Stimulation* and *Individualised Consideration*. Attributed to them is also a fifth characteristic called *Idealized Attributes* based on these four transformational styles.

### **3.7.4 Description of the MLQ**

Bass developed his model of transformational leadership based on data from interviews with 70 South African executives, in which he asked them if they had known transformational leaders, as described by Burns. From these data, he and his colleague Bruce Avolio developed an instrument which measures the full range of leadership models namely, *The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) (Bass & Avolio, 1990a, b). This is referred to as the most commonly used leadership instrument. The MLQ consists of 45 items with four factors that represent the meaning of each construct of the Full Range Model. The MLQ measures dimensions associated with effective and ineffective leadership

It measures the following dimensions of leadership:

- *Idealised influence*: transformational leaders behave in ways that result in them being admired, respected and trusted, such that their followers wish to emulate them. They are extraordinarily capable, persistent, and determined;
- *Inspirational motivation*: transformational leaders behave such that they motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning, optimism and enthusiasm for a vision of a future state.
- *Intellectual stimulation*: transformational leaders encourage followers to question assumptions, reframe problems, and approach old solutions in new ways, and to be creative and innovative. At times, their followers' ideas may differ from those of the leader, who may solicit or encourage such responses;
- *Individualised consideration*: transformational leaders actively develop the potential of their followers by creating new opportunities for development, coaching, mentoring, and paying attention to each follower's needs and desires. They know their staff well, as a result of listening, communicating, and "walking around" encouraging, rather than monitoring their efforts.

Transactional leaders display behaviours associated with corrective and constructive transactions. The constructive style is labelled *Contingent Reward* and the corrective style is labelled *Management-by-Exception* which may be either active or passive.

The two transactional components comprise:

- *Contingent Reward*, whereby approved follower actions are rewarded; disapproved actions are punished or sanctioned;
- *Management by Exception (active) and Management by Exception (passive)*, which are corrective transactional dimensions. The former involves a monitoring of performance, and intervention when judged appropriate; the latter reflects correction only when problems emerge;
- *'Laissez-faire'*: a style of leadership that is, in fact, an abrogation of leadership, since there is an absence of any transaction. This style is deemed to be most ineffective (Bass & Avolio, 1990b). Non-leadership or Laissez-Faire leaders display behaviours such as: 'Avoid getting involved when important issues arise; Absent when needed; Avoid making decisions; Delay responding to urgent questions; Avoid dealing with chronic problems; Fail to follow up requests for assistance'.

Research indicates the reliabilities of the scales by means of Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0,944; 0,736 and 0,803 for transformational, transactional, and non-transactional leadership respectively (Alimo-Metcalfe, 2000).

### **3.7.5 Administration, scoring and interpretation of the MLQ**

Respondents are urged to read the instructions prior to commencement. Thereafter, they must indicate the extent to which they describe their own leadership styles by rating their styles, answering the 45 statements on a five point scale.

This survey is designed to describe the leadership style as managers perceive it. The respondent then has to judge how frequently each statement applies to him/her. The rating scale consists of 0 on one continuum indicating, *Not at all*, 1 indicates *Once in a while*, 2 indicates *Sometimes*, 3 indicates *Fairly often* and 4 on the opposite continuum indicating, *Frequently if not always*.

The questionnaire comprises of 'positive' (for example, "I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts") and negative (for example, "I am absent when needed") items, in order to avoid answer trends. Consequently items 5, 7, 28, 33 must be considered conversely, when scoring the MLQ.

In scoring the total leadership styles, the sum of the respective seven transformational and transactional scales (also described as the theoretical scales) are added. Researchers then take the four transformational scales and average them, one for transactional leadership and management by exception (passive) and (active) for corrective leadership, and *laissez-faire* for non-leadership. A rough estimation of the scores allow one to determine the interpretation of either transformational or transactional scores. Respondents with high scores (seven and more), can be considered to be more transformational leaders whereas low scores (below seven) would imply that the respondent is a more transactional type or *laissez-faire* (non-leader).

### **3.7.6 Reliability and validity of the MLQ**

The items of the MLQ, measuring three types of leadership styles, namely transformational, transactional and laissez-faire, are reported to have a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0,85, which is significantly high and thus a reliable instrument.

The MLQ measures the broad range of Leadership from Transformational aspects such as *Idealized Influence, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual stimulation*, to Transactional aspects of *Individualised consideration, Constructive transaction and management by exception* to Laissez-faire styles. It measures dimensions associated with effective and ineffective leadership. The MLQ consists of 45 items with four factors that represented the meaning of each construct of the Full Range Model.

Research indicates the reliabilities of the scales by means of Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0,944, 0,736 and 0,803 for transformational, transactional, and non-transactional leadership respectively (Alimo-Metcalfe, 2000).

### **3.7.7 Rationale for using the MLQ**

The MLQ measures leaders perceptions of their own leadership styles. Forty-five statements are used to measure these three styles of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. In addition the MLQ also measures the leaders' level of effectiveness as a leader.

## **3.8 ORIENTATION TO LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE (OLQ)**

Participants' sense of coherence was measured by making use of the OLQ.

### **3.8.1 Development and rationale of the OLQ**

The *Orientation to Life Questionnaire* (OLQ) (Antonovsky, 1996) was used to measure participants' sense of coherence. Antonovsky, defined the concept of sense of coherence as; "A global orientation that expresses the extent to which one has a pervasive, enduring though dynamic feeling of confidence that (1) the stimuli deriving from one's internal and external environments in the course of living are structured, predictable and explicable; (2) the

resources are available to one to meet demands posed by these stimuli; and (3) these demands are challenges, worthy of investment and engagement” (Antonovsky, 1993).

### **3.8.2 Description of the OLQ**

The OLQ consists of 29 items. Antonovsky (1993) reported alpha coefficients of the OLQ in 29 research studies varying between 0,85 and 0,91. Test-retest reliability studies found coefficients between 0,41 and 0,97 (Antonovsky). Rothmann (2000) reported an alpha coefficient of 0,89 for the OLQ, which may be regarded as acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, cited in Rothmann). Regarding the construct validity of the OLQ, it was found that there is a negative relationship between the OLQ and stressful events.

As noted, the OLQ consists of three subscales:

- **Comprehensibility** (11 items). This scale measures the extent to which a person experiences the world as clearly structured and consequential. Items 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 21, 24 and 26 represent this subscale.
- **Manageability** (10 items). This scale measures the extent to which an individual experiences life events as manageable and even view these as challenges and is represented by items 2, 6, 9, 13, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27 and 29.
- **Meaningfulness** (8 items). This scale is a measure of the degree to which an individual feels that his life makes sense on an emotional and cognitive level. Items 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 16, 22 and 28 represent this subscale.

### **3.8.3 Administration, scoring and interpretation of the OLQ**

The OLQ can be administered in a group or in an individual setting (Antonovsky, 1993). Prior to commencement, respondents read the clear and detailed instructions at the beginning of the questionnaire. The respondents then indicate the point on the seven-point scale, which most accurately apply to themselves, with reference to the descriptions provided at either pole.

Scoring entails totalling the items of the subscales in order to obtain a score for each respective subscale. The sub scores are then added to as to obtain a total score for the OLQ.

Thirteen of the statements' scores have to be reversed, prior to calculation, being 1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 23, 25 and 27.

The total score of the three subscales of the OLQ provides an indication of a respondent's sense of coherence. A low score indicates, that this trait is present to a lesser extent, whereas a high score indicates the opposite. The subscale scores can be used individually to establish the extent to which each of the separate components are present. Antonovsky (1993, p. 728) however notes that the three components are "...inextricably intertwined, although they can be distinguished theoretically." Antonovsky further adds, that empirically "...it can be expected that some people will be, for example, high on comprehensibility and low on manageability, although this would be an unstable situation" (p. 729). Nevertheless, this questionnaire was constructed to measure sense of coherence as one facet, and the OLQ is "not wisely used to study component interrelations", as this would have required a different approach to the construction of the measuring instrument.

#### **3.8.4 Reliability and Validity of the OLQ**

According to Antonovsky (1993), the consistently high level of Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which ranges from 0,84 to 0,93, is illustrative of a refutable degree of internal consistency and the reliability of the OLQ. After reviewing recent validity and reliability results of the OLQ, Antonovsky found the average alpha coefficient to vary between 0,91 and 0,85. Antonovsky further notes that test-retest reliability studies indicate coefficients between 0,41 and 0,97.

Kalimo and Vuori (1990) conducted a study on 706 adults and obtained a reliability coefficient of 0,93. Rothmann (2000) refer to the research on Kalimo and Vuori, as well as that of Coetzee and Rothmann (1999), whose research delivered coefficients varying between 0,84 and 0,93. Rothmann's study on 98 employees working in a financial institution, delivered an alpha coefficient of 0,93 on the OLQ.

Antonovsky (1993), is of the opinion that it would be reasonable to expect that sense of coherence will be negatively related to anxiety, as a low sense of coherence would characterise a person whose world tends to be chaotic, who experiences undesirable and unmanageable symptoms and wonders where the individual 'fits' into things. Therefore

Rumbaut's (cited in Antonovsky) research, indicates a strong negative correlation between anxiety and sense of coherence, would serve as an indicator of discriminant validity. Frenz, Carey and Jorgensen (cited in Antonovsky) also report a negative correlation between the OLQ and anxiety (Frenz et al., cited in Antonovsky). In support of the construct validity of the OLQ, Frenz et al. (cited in Antonovsky) found a negative correlation between depression and sense of coherence, and no significant relationship between sense of coherence and intelligence.

### **3.8.5 Rationale for using the OLQ**

According to the opinion of Antonovsky (1993) the OLQ questionnaire can be used cross culturally. Antonovsky reports, that the "...distribution of responses, as shown by the range of scores and standard deviations, points to an instrument that makes considerable distinction among members of different populations". The study population used in this research, is culturally diverse, making the OLQ ideally suited. Furthermore, the OLQ best supports Antonovsky's established depiction and explanation of the sense of coherence concept, as the OLQ and sense of coherence concept developed in conjunction with one another.

## **3.9 GENERAL PERCEIVED SELF - EFFICACY SCALE (GPSES)**

The *General Perceived Self - efficacy Scale* (GPSES) (Schwarzer, 2001) was used to measure participants' generalised self - efficacy.

### **3.9.1 Rationale and development of the GPSES**

Sherer and Maddux (1982) developed a self - efficacy measuring instrument to measure the global concept of generalized self - efficacy. Collective experiences are viewed as the dynamics behind the experiences of an individual. The GPSES of Tipton and Worthington is, according its inventors (Tipton & Worthington, cited in Schwarzer, 2001), very similar to the measuring instrument of Sherer and Maddux (1982). The GPSES measures an individual's expectation of how they will perform in a variety of situations. A person expecting to be successful in a variety of settings, will demonstrate a higher level of self - efficacy.

### **3.9.2 Description of the GPSES**

The GPSES consists of 10 items. Schwarzer (2001) found alpha coefficients varying from 0,75 to 0,90 for the GPSES. Respondents indicate their responses to statements by marking their choice in a four-point scale, where one is “not at all true”, two is “hardly true”, three is “moderately true” and four is “exactly true”. By confirmatory factor analyses it was found that the scale was unidimensional in all sub-samples. The scale is not only reliable, it has also proven valid in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. Schwarzer found that the scale correlates positively with self-esteem and optimism and negatively with anxiety, depression and physical symptoms.

### **3.9.3 Administration, scoring and interpretation of the GPSES**

The GPSES can be administered in a group or individual setting. Prior to commencement, respondents are required to read the instructions. Thereafter they must indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the ten statements on the four-point scale. Respondents are advised to give their first impression, rather than engaging in extensive contemplation.

According to Bandura (1986) a person measuring strongly on self - efficacy, will be more prone toward motivation to perform tasks in a skilled and competent manner, to cope with failure by viewing tasks as a challenge, rather than focusing on the shortcomings, apply concentration and effort according to the requirements of the situation and become even more motivated when encountering difficulties.

### **3.9.4 Validity and Reliability of the GPSES**

The GPSES manual provides a description of the reliability and validity of the instrument.

According to Schwarzer (2001), alpha-coefficients of the GPSES vary from 0,75 to 0,90 and it is valid in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. The research of Rothmann (2000) illustrates a reliability coefficient of 0,80. Schwarzer found a negative correlation between self - efficacy as measured by the GPSES, and anxiety, depression and physical symptoms and a positive correlation with selfworth and optimism.

### **3.9.5 Rationale for using the GPSES**

Due to the fact that four questionnaires were employed in this study, it was deemed necessary to make use of short tests. Whereas the GPSES has only ten items, the self - efficacy questionnaire of Sherer and Maddux (1982) is a twenty-seven-item questionnaire. In addition, available research illustrate a reputable degree of reliability.

### **3.10 WORK LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE (WLCS)**

The WLCS was used to measure participants' locus of control.

#### **3.10.1 Development and rationale of the WLCS**

In order to measure his construct of locus of control, Rotter (cited in Rothmann, 2000) developed the *Internal-External locus of Control Scale*, which consists of 23 locus of control items and 6 filter items in a forced choice format.

#### **3.10.2 Description of the WLCS**

The *Work Locus of Control Scale* (WLCS) (Spector, 1988) was used to measure participants' locus of control within the work environment. The WLCS consists of 16 items, on a six-point scale whereby they agree or disagree with the statements. At the one extreme lies 1, which means, that the respondent does not agree at all with the statement. At the other extreme lies 6, implying entire agreement with the statement. In between these tow extremes, the respondent has a choice between "disagree moderately", "disagree slightly", "agree slightly" and "agree moderately". Respondents are encouraged to answer according to their first, spontaneous reaction and not to ponder too long over any one item. All questions have to be answered.

The WLCS is scored by rating the items conversely. An individual with a high score on internal control and autonomy and a low score on external control, will be viewed as a well-adjusted person, whereas a person with opposite scores, may tend to hold external forces accountable for things that go wrong, and poor performance.

Numerous researchers have raised doubts about the unidimensionality of this scale and the level of generalisation of the locus of control construct. According to Blau (cited in Abrams, 1985), differences in behaviour between *internals* and *externals* are manifested in different domains of human endeavour such as education, work politics, and health. In light of the above, researchers have developed more domain specific locus of control orientation, in order to enhance the productiveness of locus of control. It is argued that the Work Locus of Control Scale proposed by Spector (1988), may predict work behaviour more precisely than the general scales.

To assess respondents' locus of control beliefs, Spector's (1988) Work Locus of Control scale was used. The scale is a 16-item measure of generalised control beliefs in the organisational and work-related setting. Items are scored on a seven point Likert type response format, ranging from (1) "disagree very much" to (7) "Agree very much". Scores range from 16 to 112, where low scores represent internality and high scores externality.

Spector (1988) reports significant correlations with Rotter's general internal-external Locus of Control Scale. In addition, Spector, reports Cronbach's alpha coefficients, indicating internal consistency, of 0.85 for 4 independent samples and coefficients of 0.75 and 0.80 for a further 2 samples. The Work locus of Control Scale has also been used in several South African studies where similar reliability coefficients were yielded. In a study by Nunns and Argirys (cited in Abrams, 1985), the scale was found to demonstrate an acceptable level of reliability coefficient of 0.84. In the present study the Cronbach's alpha was 0.80 which is deemed to be an acceptable reliability.

### **3.10.3 Reliability and validity of the WLCS**

Spector (1988) found Cronbach alpha coefficients for the WLCS varying between 0,75 and 0,85. In an attempt to validate the WLCS, Spector correlated it against work variables which had been correlated previously with Rotter's scale. He reported that many of the correlations between work locus of control and organisational variables were stronger than the correlations observed between those same variables and Rotter's scale. Spector found evidence for the construct validity of the WLCS. Spector argued that the WLCS predicts work behaviour more precisely than general scales, which measure locus of control. The research of Rothmann (2000) delivered an alpha coefficient of 0,70.

### **3.10.4 Rationale for using the WLCS**

The WLCS is suited for the purposes of the study, as it measures locus of control within the work context and Spector (1988) indicates that although limited, earlier research indicates proof of validity.

## **3.11 RESEARCH PROCEDURE**

This section provides a discussion of the research methodology followed during the administration and scoring of the measuring instruments.

### **3.11.1 Preceding arrangements**

Prior to the commencement of this research, an appointment was made with the Director of the organisation, in order to determine the viability of conducting research in the organisation. The researcher discussed the purpose of the proposal and the proposal was accepted.

### **3.11.2 Administration of measuring instruments**

The measuring battery was compiled, which was provided to leaders within the organisation. The purpose of the study, anonymity, the confidentiality of the data collected, as well as general logistical arrangements, were communicated. It was stressed that participation was entirely voluntary. The above was also indicated on a cover letter that accompanied the measuring battery. Questionnaires were addressed to each individual at their place of work, with a self-addressed envelope to the researcher. Completed questionnaires were thus forwarded to the researcher. After the statistical analysis, feedback on the research results were provided to participants on request.

### **3.11.3 Statistical analysis**

The Statistical Consulting Services of PU for CHE, Vaal Triangle Campus, captured the statistical analysis. The alpha-coefficient was used to determine the validity and reliability of the measuring instruments. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were used

to analyse data. The mean indicates the average score obtained by the research group on each measuring instrument and the standard deviation indicates the extent to which individual scores differ from the mean obtained.

T-tests were conducted to decide the significance of the sizes. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was determined so as to indicate the extent to which one variable was related to another. A multi-regression analysis was done to determine the percentage variance. A correlation can be better understood by determining  $r^2$  (Cohen, 1990). The square of the correlation coefficient indicates the proportion of variance in any two variables, which is predicted by the variance in the other. Lastly, canonical correlations were used to determine the correlation between leadership styles and psychological strengths in total (as measured by sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control).

### **3.11.3.1 Descriptive statistics**

- **Arithmetic mean**

The description of results was done with arithmetic means and standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis. The arithmetic mean according to Shaughnessy & Zechmeister (1997), describes the typical score in a group of scores and it is an important summary measure of group performance. The arithmetic mean is the best-known measurement of locality and is used to indicate the mean (average) score of the study population on each questionnaire. The standard deviation approximates the average distance of a score from the mean. The higher the standard deviation, the greater the distance is, on average, from the arithmetic mean.

- **Skewness and kurtosis**

Skewness is a descriptive indication of symmetry, which gives an indication of the level of skewness (positive or negative) of a population, whereas kurtosis indicates the level of pointedness of a distribution of scores. Skewness (this term was first used by Pearson) measures the deviation of the distribution from symmetry. If the skewness is clearly different from 0, then that distribution is asymmetrical, while normal distributions are perfectly symmetrical. If the kurtosis (which measures “peakedness” of the distribution) is clearly different from 0, then the distribution is either flatter or more peaked than normal.

- **Reliability**

The Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to determine the internal consistency of each of the items of the questionnaires used in this study. This index is indicative of the extent to which all the items in the questionnaire measure the same characteristics consistently (Huysamen, 1993).

- **Validity**

Construct validity was used in this study. Construct validity can be defined as the extent to which the test measures the theoretical construct it is intended to measure (Shaughnessy & Zechmeister, 1997). Factor analysis was done on the data and the three indicators for construct validity are:

1. Commonalities which is the proportion of the variance of each item, which is accounted for by the common factors, has to be high.
2. Few common factors explain a large percentage of the total variance. Ideally only one factor for each supposed construct has to be extracted.
3. Allocation of each factor to the items of the supported constructs.

- **Significant differences between groups**

The independent samples t-test is based on the difference between the two sample means, so the expected value of t when the independent variable has had no effect is zero. If the independent variable has had an effect, however, the t will differ from zero. The obtained t must be compared with a critical value from the appropriate t distribution to determine if it is statistically significant (Shaughnessy & Zechmeister, 1997).

The t test was used to determine the differences between leadership styles and tenure and gender. A 5% level of significance was used. Significant differences were indicated with p-values less than 0.05.

- **Practical significance**

Practical significance is only calculated for statistical significant differences. According to Cohen (1990) valid cut-off points for practical significance are the following:

d.> 0.2 (small effect)

$d > 0.5$  (medium effect)

$d > 0.8$  (large effect and of practical importance)

For the purposes of this study, the  $d$ -values of 0.5 (medium effect) and higher are viewed as practically significant.

- **Correlations**

Pearson correlations were used to determine the relationship between constructs. The cut off points: for practical significance is as follows (r-Pearson correlation):

$r = 0.1$  (small effect)

$r = 0.3$  (medium effect)

$r = 0.5$  (large effect and of practical importance)

- **Regression analysis**

Regression analysis will be used to describe the relationship between variables (Cohen, 1990). The multiple regression was done with sense of coherence, locus of control and self-efficacy as dependant variables and transformational, transactional and Laissez-faire leadership styles as independent variables.

According to Cohen (1990) a correlation ( $r$ ) can only be better understood by determining its square ( $r^2$ ). A regression analysis is used to determine the proportion of the total variance of one variable that is explained by another variable. In this study, a multiple regression analysis is conducted to determine the proportion of the total variance of leadership styles (independent variables) and sense of coherence, locus of control and self-efficacy (dependant variables).

### **3.12 HYPOTHESES FORMULATION**

The following nil and alternative hypotheses are formulated in conjunction with the specific research objectives.

#### **3.12.1 Nil hypotheses**

HO1: No practically significant relationship exists between sense of coherence and transactional and transformational leadership styles in an organisation.

HO2: No practically significant relationship exists between generalised self - efficacy and transactional and transformational leadership styles in an organisation.

HO3: No practically significant relationship exists between locus of control and transactional and transformational leadership styles in an organisation.

HO4: The level of leadership styles is not a predictor of the level of sense of coherence of leaders in an organisation.

HO5: The level of leadership styles is not a predictor of the level of generalised self - efficacy of leaders in an organisation.

HO6: The level of leadership styles is not a predictor of the level of locus of control of leaders in an organisation.

### **3.12.2 Alternative hypotheses**

H1: A practically significant relationship exists between sense of coherence and leadership styles in an organisation.

H2: A practically significant relationship exists between generalised self - efficacy and leadership styles in an organisation.

H3: A practically significant relationship exists between locus of control and leadership styles in an organisation.

H4: The level of leadership styles is a predictor of the level of sense of coherence of leaders in an organisation.

H5: The level of leadership styles is a predictor of the level of generalised self - efficacy of leaders in an organisation.

H6: The level of leadership styles is a predictor of the level of locus of control of leaders in an organisation.

### **3.13 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

This chapter provides clarification on the research methodology, specifically referring to the measuring instruments, study population, research procedure and statistical methods applied in this study. This chapter concludes with the formulation of the research hypotheses.

In Chapter 4 the results of the empirical research will be communicated and discussed.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results of the empirical research will be reported and discussed. The statistical means ( $\bar{X}$ ), standard deviations ( $S$ ), as well as minimum (MIN) and maximum (MAX) values of each measuring instrument will be reported. Practically significant differences will be indicated, where applicable. Correlations between the various measuring instruments will be determined by means of the Pearson correlation coefficient ( $r$ ). In the case of significant correlations, a multiple regression analysis will be done in order to determine the predictive value. Lastly, canonical correlations will be used to determine the correlation between leadership styles and psychological strengths in total (as measured by sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control).

#### 4.2 RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

The Cronbach alpha coefficients ( $\alpha$ ) of the respective measuring instruments were determined, so as to provide an indication of the internal consistency of the various measuring instruments.

##### 4.2.1 The internal consistency for the MLQ (leadership styles)

The alpha coefficient for the MLQ is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

*Reliability coefficient of the MLQ*

	<i>Alpha coefficient</i>
<i>Multi Factor Leadership Questionnaire</i>	0,85

As evidenced in Table 2, the alpha coefficient of the MLQ in this study is 0,85; which compares favourably with Bass and Avolio's reported alpha coefficient of 0,81.

#### 4.2.2 The internal consistency of the OLQ (sense of coherence)

The alpha coefficient obtained for the OLQ, is reflected in table 3.

Table 3

*Reliability coefficient of the OLQ*

	<i>Alpha coefficient</i>
<i>Orientation to Life Questionnaire</i>	0, 87

As indicated by Table 3, the alpha coefficient of the OLQ in this study was calculated at 0,87. This compares satisfactorily to Antonovsky's (1993) respective Cronbach's alpha coefficients, ranging from 0,84 to 0,93 and 0,91 to 0,85. Human (cited in Rothmann, 2000) obtained an alpha coefficient of 0,64.

#### 4.2.3 The internal consistency of the GPSES (self - efficacy)

The alpha coefficient obtained for the GPSES, is reflected in Table 4 below.

Table 4

*Reliability coefficient of the GPSES*

	<i>Alpha coefficient</i>
<i>General Perceived Self - efficacy Scale</i>	0, 76

An alpha coefficient of 0,76 was obtained for the GPSES in this study. This is a high score and compares well to Schwarzer's (2001) finding, that alpha coefficients vary between 0,75 and 0,90 as well as Rothmann (2000) alpha coefficient of 0,80. Human (cited in Rothmann) obtained an alpha coefficient of 0,83 in this regard.

#### 4.2.4 The internal consistency of the WLCS (work locus of control)

The alpha coefficient obtained for the WLCS, is provided in Table 5 below.

Table 5

*Reliability coefficient of the WLCS*

<i>Alpha coefficient</i>	
<i>Work Locus of Control Scale</i>	0,81

As indicated above, an alpha coefficient of 0,81 was obtained on the WLCS. This is an adequate score and compares reasonably well with Spector's (1988) Cronbach alpha coefficients, which varies between 0,75 and 0,85. Human (cited in Rothmann, 2000) obtained an alpha coefficient of 0,51 on the WLCS.

### 4.3 THE TYPE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF MANAGERS IN AN ORGANISATION

The statistical means — (  $X$  ), standard deviations (  $S$  ), as well as minimum (MIN) and maximum (MAX) values of the Multi-Factor Leadership Styles Questionnaire (MLQ) and its three subscales (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) were determined. The values obtained in these regards are reflected in Table 6.

Table 6

*Descriptive statistics with regard to the MLQ*

<i>ITEM</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>MIN</i>	<i>MAX</i>
<i>TRANSFORMATIONAL</i>	86	12,83	1,47	8,20	15,80
<i>TRANSACTIONAL</i>	86	9,81	1,63	6,00	13,33
<i>LAISSEZ-FAIRE</i>	86	5,25	2,42	1,00	15,0

For the purposes of interpretation of data, a *low leadership* score implies *low levels* of leadership thus high levels of non-leadership. In other words the higher the leadership score the lower the level of non-leadership.

The MLQ consists of 45 items with four factors, which are evaluated on a 4 point scale. The highest score that can be obtained on the total MLQ scale, as well as its subscales, is 16. Table 6 indicates, that the research group obtained the highest mean score on the transformational subscale, with a lower mean score on the transactional scale and the lowest score being obtained on the laissez-faire (non-leadership) scale. This implies that respondents

perceive their own leadership styles as more transformational and less transactional or laissez-faire. Furthermore the average scores imply that 12,8% of the participants perceive their own leadership style as being transformational, with 9,8% perceiving their leadership style to being transactional and a low 5% perceiving themselves as having no leadership style at all.

The total of the transformational, transactional subscales provides an indication of the study populations' global perception of their leadership style. The scores obtained in the MLQ, in the three subscales, indicated a standard deviation of 15,0; which is particularly high. This implies that leaders perceive their own leadership style to be overtly transformational and thus a more effective style of leadership. It is the researchers opinion that a possible explanation for the above result is that leaders in this study assessed themselves as being more positive and transformational than they in fact are due to the fact that the questionnaire was used as a self-assessment as opposed to the popular 360 degree method of assessment used by colleagues, superiors, peers and subordinates. In addition, studies conducted by Alimo -Metcalf and Alimo-Metcalf, (2000) indicated that higher performers in the field of management and leadership are less likely to inflate their self-ratings than are low performers.

Differences in leadership styles between participants with different gender, age, levels of education and tenure were determined. No significant ( $p < 0,05$ ) differences were found with regard to leadership styles and age, language, education however a significant correlation was found regarding leadership styles and tenure. Regarding gender correlations Perrault and Irwin (cited in Alimo-Metcalf & Alimo-Metcalf, 2000) found that male and female managers differed significantly in their assessment of their own leadership styles, which is made evident in this research. However the differences are not significant enough as the sample of females is only 11%, which may also have influenced the results. Bogler (cited in Alimo-Metcalf & Alimo-Metcalf, 2000) found that gender, potentially influenced responses in his related study of male and female evaluations of their leaders whereby females rated male leaders as being more transformational than their male counterparts who rated them as more transactional. In addition, age and education were found to be significantly different in leadership styles, which was not replicated in this study. Reasons for these differences included mature participants having more advanced knowledge, skills and attributes than their younger counterparts. Other reasons may also include on-the-job training,

experience and development in more specialist leadership skills. The same may be said for tenure whereby leaders have many years of experience in this specific organisation and thus have a good understanding and background to the business and have moved into more senior positions over a period of time.

In this study, marked correlations were found between leadership styles and tenure. T-tests were done so as to decide the significance of sizes, which are indicated in Table 7 below.

Table 7

*Differences between leadership styles and tenure*

ITEM	Mean 2	Mean 3	T- value	P	Valid N 2	Valid N 3	S2	S3
TRANSFORMATIONAL	13,11	12,79	0,80	0,54	14	26	1,70	1,53
TRANSACTIONAL	9,09	10,10	-1,95	0,05	14	26	1,68	1,48
LAISSÉZ-FAIRE	4,57	5,46	-0,99	0,32	14	26	2,2	2,9

Table 7 above indicates, that p-values smaller than 0,05 were obtained on levels of education (1-5 years and 6-10 years) and one dimension of leadership style, (transactional leadership). Negative T-values were obtained, indicating that transformational leaders obtained higher mean scores than transactional and laissez-faire leaders. High mean scores indicate that leaders who have been in their leadership position longer than 6 to 10 years are more transactional in their style as opposed to their counterparts who have been in the position for five years or less being more transformational. This corresponds with other findings that a leader's organisational commitment and demonstration through years of service is an important influencer of leadership style, being someone who believes in the organisations visions and goals yet conversely hesitates to change current behaviours.

As illustrated in Table 8 below, a review of the study population indicates, that females perceive themselves displaying more transformational leadership styles than their male counterparts who display more transactional styles of leadership.

Table 8

*Differences between leadership styles and gender*

ITEM	Mean 1	Mean 2	T- value	P	Valid N 1	Valid N 2	S1	S2
TRANSFORMATIONAL	12,86	-0,05	84	76	10	1,53	1,03	2,17
TRANSACTIONAL	9,73	0,15	84	76	10	1,65	1,56	1,10
LAISSEZ-FAIRE	4,90	0,49	84	76	10	2,47	2,07	1,41

As noted in Chapter 2, writers such as Helgesen and Rosener (cited in Goodwin, 2001), have claimed that the leadership styles of woman and men are different, along the lines of women being less hierarchical, more co operative and collaborative, and more orientated to enhancing others sense of self-worth. These characteristics and behaviours are described in the previous section as indicative of more transformational leaders. Furthermore, Eagly (2000) states that leaders not only have gender expectancies placed on them by their followers, they also have internalised expectancies placed on themselves, which influences their leadership style.

Table 9

*Differences between Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire leadership styles*

ITEM	N	X	S	MIN	MAX
<b>TRANSFORMATIONAL (Total)</b>	86	<b>12,83</b>	<b>1,47</b>	<b>8,2</b>	<b>15,8</b>
Idealised Influence (Attributes)	86	12,96	2,10	6,00	16,0
Idealised Influence (Behaviour)	86	12,73	2,03	8,00	16,0
Inspirational motivation	86	<b>13,15</b>	<b>1,99</b>	<b>5,0</b>	<b>16,0</b>
Intellectual stimulation	86	12,16	2,34	3,0	16,0
Individualised consideration	86	<b>13,17</b>	<b>1,99</b>	<b>8,0</b>	<b>16,0</b>
<b>TRANSACTIONAL (Total)</b>	86	<b>9,81</b>	<b>1,63</b>	<b>6,0</b>	<b>13,33</b>
Constructive transaction	86	13,13	2,13	7,0	16,0
Management by exception (active)	86	11,60	3,24	1,0	16,0
Management by exception (passive)	86	4,68	2,82	0,0	15,0
LAISSEZ-FAIRE	86	<b>5,2</b>	<b>2,42</b>	<b>1,0</b>	<b>15,0</b>

For the purposes of interpretation of data, the two highest scores in each subscale will be interpreted, namely *inspirational motivation* and *individualised consideration* for transformational leaders and *management by exception (active)* and *constructive transaction* for transactional leaders.

*Inspirational motivation* reflects a score of 13,15 in this study, which is moderately high and implies that leaders perceive themselves to inspire and motivate their followers through providing them with support, feedback and motivational behaviours.

*Individualised consideration* reflects a score of 13,17 in this study, which is significantly high and may be related to an individual's need for support and to encourage personal growth in followers. In research conducted by Vandenberg and Gobert (cited in Robbins, 2001) a leader that was 'individually considerate', was perceived as threatening by followers and was associated with favouritism and inequity. Leaders in this study thus perceived their style as high on supporting followers and encouraging their growth.

Transactional leadership styles is reflected by *Management by exception (active)* which involves 'intervening only when judged appropriate' and has a mean of 11,60 as opposed to *Management by exception (passive)* which involves 'correction only when problems emerge' and reflects a mean of 4,68. These are corrective transactional dimensions and imply that the current research group perceive themselves as being more 'active' in providing employees with corrective action and feedback to improve. In research conducted by Eagly (2000) male leaders were found to be more transactional and waited until problems became severe before attempting to correct them as opposed to their female counterparts.

Laissez-faire or non-leadership has been found to be ineffective and dissatisfying for followers and is reflected as 5,2 % for this research group, which is not significant in this study.

#### **4.4 THE LEVEL OF SENSE OF COHERENCE OF MANAGERS IN AN ORGANISATION**

The statistical means ( $\bar{X}$ ), standard deviations ( $S$ ), as well as minimum (MIN) and maximum (MAX) values of the Orientation to Life Questionnaire (OLQ) and its three

subscales (comprehensibility, manageability and meaningfulness) were determined. The values obtained in these regards, are reflected in Table 10.

Table 10

*Descriptive statistics with regard to the OLQ*

ITEM	N	X	S	MIN	MAX
<i>OLQ (TOTAL)</i>	86	153,15	21,53	90,00	199,00
<i>COMPREHENSIBILITY</i>	86	52,93	11,40	20,00	74,00
<i>MANAGEABILITY</i>	86	53,20	7,09	38,00	70,00
<i>MEANINGFULNESS</i>	86	47,01	7,31	18,00	59,00

The OLQ consists of 29 items, which are evaluated on a seven-point scale. The highest score that can be obtained on the total OLQ scale is 203. The comprehensibility subscale has a maximum score of 74, the manageability subscale has a maximum score of 70 and the meaningfulness subscale has a maximum score of 59.

Table 10 indicates that the research group obtained the highest mean score on the manageability subscale, which implies that they experience life events as manageable and view these as challenges. The total of the three subscales provides an indication of the study population's global sense of coherence. The mean score obtained on the OLQ in this study is 153,15; with a standard deviation of 21,53. The score can be considered to fall within the above average range (130 - 160), implying that the research group has particularly high levels of sense of coherence. Human (cited in Rothmann, 2000) obtained a mean score on the OLQ of 137,2; with the highest mean score obtained on the comprehensibility subscale, which is somewhat lower than the results obtained on the comprehensibility subscale obtained by this research group. Coetzee and Rothmann (1999) obtained a mean score of 139,96 on the OLQ, with a standard deviation of 21,68; which is lower than the scores obtained in this study, but nevertheless falls within the average range. This high score indicated above implies then that the leaders within this organisation experience the world as very structured and consequential. As indicated by Antonovsky (1993) in Chapter 3, should participants have scored high on comprehensibility and low on manageability, this would be an unstable situation, the study however has not replicated this.

Differences between the sense of coherence of participants of different genders, age, level of education and tenure, were determined. No significant ( $p < 0,05$ ) differences were found with regard to sense of coherence and gender, age, qualifications or tenure.

#### 4.5 THE LEVEL OF GENERALISED SELF - EFFICACY OF MANAGERS IN AN ORGANISATION

The statistical means ( $\bar{X}$ ), standard deviations ( $S$ ), as well as minimum (MIN) and maximum (MAX) values of the Generalised Perceived Self - efficacy Scale (GPSES) were determined. The values obtained in this regard, are reflected in Table 11.

Table 11

*Descriptive statistics with regard to the GPSES*

ITEM	N	X	S	MIN	MAX
GSE(TOTAL)	86	34,79	3,39	25,00	40,00

The GPSES consists of 10 items, which are evaluated on a four-point scale. The highest score that can be obtained on the total GPSES scale is 40 and the lowest score is 25, implying that an average score would lie in the region of 35. The mean score obtained on the GPSES in this study, is 34,7 with a standard deviation of 3,39, which can be considered to fall within the average range. Human (cited in Rothmann, 2000) obtained a similar mean score of 34,1 with regard to the GPSES. The participants in this study may thus have a belief that they are able to mobilise their motivation, cognitive resources and specific actions to comply with situational requirements. According to Bandura (1986) people get involved in activities that they judge themselves capable of handling thus a leader with a high self - efficacy has more positive beliefs about their abilities than do people with low self-esteem. Differences between the self - efficacy of different genders, ages, education and tenure were determined. No significant ( $p < 0,05$ ) differences were found with regard to self - efficacy and any of the above biographical characteristics, except for a correlation between self - efficacy and level of education. A T-test was done to decide the significance of this relationship, the results of which is indicated in Table 12. Category 4 refers to a postgraduate degree or qualification and category 5 refers to 'Other' qualifications not listed for example a technical qualification, qualified electrician or other.

Table 12

*Differences between self - efficacy of participants with different levels of education*

<i>ITEM</i>	Mean 4	Mean 5	T- value	P	Valid N 4	Valid N 5	S4	S5
Self - efficacy	33,87	36,14	-2,11	0,05	8	7	1,55	2,5

Table 12 indicates that a p-value equivalent to 0,05 was obtained on level of education and self - efficacy. Negative T-values were obtained, indicating that the participants in category 4 (postgraduate qualifications) are experiencing lower levels of self - efficacy than are the participants from category 5 (other qualifications not listed). This may possibly be related to the fact that the electrical industry is a very specialised field and that 'other' qualifications such as electrical diplomas (qualified electrician) or more technical qualifications suffice in this industry as opposed to having a tertiary qualification, especially when dealing with technical aspects on the job, advising customers and developing and coaching technical staff in the field. Paglis and Green (2002) found that leaders with high self - efficacy engaged in more leadership behaviours and attempts with their followers as opposed to those who had a low self - efficacy. Furthermore, Bandura (1997) found that mastery experiences are traditionally viewed as important influencers of self - efficacy in leaders as they provide evidence of whether one is able to accomplish what it takes to succeed.

#### **4.6 THE LEVEL OF WORK LOCUS OF CONTROL OF MANAGERS IN AN ORGANISATION**

The statistical means ( $\bar{X}$ ) standard deviations (S) as well as minimum (MIN) and maximum (MAX) values of the Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS) were determined. The values obtained in this regard, are reflected in Table 13.

Table 13

*Descriptive statistics with regard to the WLCS*

<i>ITEM</i>	N	X	S	MIN	MAX
WLCS (TOTAL)	86	58,95	13,12	0,00	91,00

The WLCS consists of 16 items, which are evaluated on a six-point scale. The lower end of the continuum (16) represents the internal locus of control extreme (internality), whereas the other end (112) represents a strong external orientation (externality). The mean score obtained on the WLCS in this study is 58,95; with a standard deviation of 13,12. The axis of the continuum is 55, implying that the participants in this study generally lean toward an external orientation. The participants may therefore be more inclined to believe that outcomes are primarily determined by outside forces such as luck, fate other people or circumstances. Differences between the locus of control of different genders, ages, education levels and tenure were determined. No significant ( $p < 0,05$ ) differences were found with regard to locus of control and gender, age, qualification level or tenure.

#### 4.7 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AND SENSE OF COHERENCE, LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SELF - EFFICACY

The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) was determined in order to measure the linear relationships between the variables in this study. The inter-correlations between leadership styles (Independent variable) and sense of coherence, locus of control and self – efficacy (Dependant variables), are reflected in Table 14.

Table 14

##### *Inter-correlations*

	MLQ TF	MLQ TS	MLQ NL	SC Co	SE T	LC T
MLQ TF	1,00	0,51**	0,18	0,28	0,43*	0,00
MLQ TS	0,51**	1,00	0,42*	-0,04	0,41*	0,11
MLQ NL	0,18	0,42*	1,00	-0,24	0,05	0,26
SC Co	0,28	-0,04	-0,24	1,00	0,27	-0,27
SE T	0,43*	0,41*	0,05	0,27	1,00	-0,02
LC T	0,00	0,11	0,26	-0,27	-0,02	1,00

\* Correlation is practically significant  $r = 0,30$  (medium effect)

\*\*Correlation is practically significant  $r = 0,50$  (large effect)

For the purposes of this study,  $r$  – values greater than 0,30 will be accepted as practically significant.

Table 14 indicates that a positive medium correlation is evident between transformational leadership and self - efficacy. In other words, the more transformational the leadership style, the higher the self - efficacy tends to be. More specifically, it can be seen, that medium correlations were found between transactional leadership styles and levels of self - efficacy. No significant correlation was however found between self - efficacy and non-leadership. The hypothesis stating that no significant relationship exists between leadership styles and self - efficacy (HO2), can be rejected. The alternative hypothesis (H2), which proposes that a significant relationship exists between leadership styles and self - efficacy, can therefore be accepted. This concurs with findings of Prussia, Anderson and Manz (1998) who found that transformational leadership was related to strong levels of self - efficacy. Furthermore, a person expecting to be successful will demonstrate a higher level of self - efficacy, which may be developed through learning and modelling of transformational behaviours in the workplace. These behaviours include task and goal-setting.

Furthermore, a large correlation exists between transformational and transactional leadership styles whereas a positive medium correlation was found between transactional leadership and non-leadership. No significant correlation exists between transformational leadership and non-leadership.

As evidenced by Table 14, no practically significant correlation was found between leadership styles and work locus of control. The alternative hypothesis, which suggests that a practically significant relationship exists between leadership styles and work locus of control, must therefore, be rejected in favour of the hypothesis (H3) which denies any practically significant relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and locus of control. A significant correlation was however found between external locus of control and non-leadership styles (*laissez-faire*); suggesting that managers perceived the results or outcomes of situations as being due to forces beyond their control. Howell and Avolio (1993), however, found a positive correlation between transformational and transactional leaders and locus of control.

In conclusion, Table 14 lastly indicates, that a medium negative relationship exists between work locus of control and sense of coherence. In other words, a high sense of coherence is related to a decrease in locus of control. This is in contrast with the findings of Rothmann

(2000), who found a positive correlation between sense of coherence and internal locus of control.

#### **4.7.1 Multiple regression analysis**

A multiple regression analysis was done in order to determine the percentage variance between practically significant correlations (Rothmann, 2000).

No practically significant correlation was found between transformational and transactional leadership styles and locus of control however a correlation was found between external locus of control and non-leadership. Consequently it can be concluded, that leadership styles do not predict locus of control, however non-leadership is a consequence of external locus of control. A regression analysis was also utilised and confirms the above finding. The hypothesis (H6) stating that the level of leadership styles is a predictor of self - efficacy, is thus accepted in favour of H06, which proposes that the level of leadership styles is not a predictor of locus of control.

Meaningful correlations were, however, found to exist between leadership styles and sense of coherence, as well as between leadership styles and self - efficacy.

##### **4.7.1.1 Multiple regression analysis with regard to leadership styles and sense of coherence**

The regression analysis of leadership styles indicates, that  $r^2 = 0,199$ , which implies that 19,9% of the variance in sense of coherence is predicted by leadership styles. Leadership styles in itself can, therefore, not predict sense of coherence completely, as it predicts only 19,9% of the sense of coherence. Nevertheless, leadership styles have some predictive value with regard to sense of coherence. The hypothesis (H4) stating, that the level of leadership styles acts as predictor of sense of coherence, can thus be accepted.

##### **4.7.1.2 Multiple regression analysis with regard to leadership styles and generalised self - efficacy**

The regression analysis of leadership styles indicates, that  $r^2 = 0,24$ ; which implies that 24% of the variance in self - efficacy is predicted by leadership styles. Leadership styles can, therefore, not predict generalised self - efficacy completely, as it predicts only 24% of generalised self - efficacy. Nevertheless, leadership styles have predictive value with regard to generalised self - efficacy. Accordingly the hypothesis (H5) proposing that the level of leadership styles can predict self - efficacy, cannot be rejected.

#### 4.7.2 Canonical Analysis with Regard to Leadership Styles and Psychological Strengths (as measured by Sense of Coherence, Generalised Self - Efficacy and Work Locus of Control)

Canonical correlations were done in order to determine the relationship between the total score of leadership styles with the psychological strengths, sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and locus of control in totality. These canonical correlations are reported in Table 15.

Table 15

*Canonical correlations between leadership styles and psychological strengths*

<b>Canonical analysis summary</b>		
<i>Canonical r = 0,51</i>		<i>p = 0,000</i>
	<i>Leadership Styles</i>	<i>Sense of coherence, generalised self- efficacy and work locus of control</i>
<b>Number of variables</b>	3	3
<i>Variance extracted</i>	100%	100%
<i>Total redundancy</i>	18,13%	17,32%

Table 15 above indicates, that a canonical r of 0,51 was obtained, which can be considered to be a large effect and a p-value smaller than 0,05, was obtained. The canonical r-value of 0,51 can be interpreted as the simple correlation between the weighted sum scores in each set, with the weights pertaining to the leadership styles root. Leadership styles thus has a large effect on the psychological strengths, sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and work locus of control, in totality. The information provided in the 'total redundancy' row, indicates that approximately 18,13% of the variance in leadership styles can be accounted for by the

psychological strengths in the right column. Likewise, 17,32% of the variance in the psychological strengths, can be accounted for by leadership styles.

#### **4.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In this chapter the results of the research were reported and discussed. The descriptive statistics and reliability coefficients of the measuring instruments were reported. The levels of leadership styles, sense of coherence, work locus of control and generalised self - efficacy of the research group followed. The correlations and practical significance between leadership styles on the one hand and sense of coherence, work locus of control and self - efficacy on the other hand, were then provided. The predictive value of leadership styles with regard to sense of coherence, work locus of control and self - efficacy were presented by means of a multiple regression analysis. Lastly, canonical correlations were done in order to determine the relationship between leadership and psychological strengths. Findings in the study have shown that a practically significant relationship does exist between sense of coherence and transformational leadership. A practically significant relationship exists between generalised self - efficacy and leadership styles in an organisation and a practically significant relationship exists between locus of control and non-leadership styles within the organisation.

In lieu of the above, the level of leadership styles is therefore a predictor of the level of sense of coherence of leaders in an organisation. The level of leadership styles is a predictor of the level of generalised self - efficacy of leaders in an organisation and the level of leadership styles is a predictor of the level of locus of control of laissez-faire (non-leadership) within the organisation.

With the conclusion of this chapter, all empirical objectives and hypotheses have been answered and reasoned.

In the last chapter conclusions will be made regarding the literature findings and results of the empirical investigations. The limitations of this research will be discussed and recommendations for the organisation, as well as future research, will be proposed.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 4 provides a discussion of the results of the research. In this chapter conclusions regarding the literature study and the results of the empirical research will be made. Shortcomings of the research will be discussed, and recommendations for the organisation and future research suggestions will be made.

#### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions regarding the specific theoretical objectives and the results of the empirical research will be made.

##### 5.1.1 Conclusions regarding the specific theoretical objectives

In line with the first specific objective stated in chapter 1, leadership styles, sense of coherence, locus of control, and generalised self - efficacy, as well as the relationships between these constructs, were conceptualised from literature.

*Leadership styles* was conceptualised from literature, as being a construct that reaches beyond merely being transformational and transactional, but includes various influencers, such as gender, tenure, motivation and performance. Leadership styles also vary according to personal attributes and contextual factors and was shown to hold consequences for both the individual leader and organisation, for example a reduction in psychological well-being, organisational commitment, and effectiveness, and an increase in anxiety, stress and depression.

*Salutogenesis* was described as a broad paradigm, which studies the individual's ability to manage stress, to stay healthy and live an optimal life through coping amidst a host of stressors. Sense of coherence, locus of control and self - efficacy are three psychological strengths, which are incorporated within the salutogenic paradigm.

*Sense of coherence* was conceptualised as a disposition which is a determinant of an individuals' position on the health-ease/dis-ease continuum. This then allows an individual to select suitable strategies to cope with specific stressors. An individual with a strong sense of coherence, experiences stimuli and information from the environment, which in turn falls within a sphere of interest and is either comprehensible, manageable and meaningful. A high sense of coherence has *inter alia* been associated with successfully coping and general well-being. A low sense of coherence is thus associated with anxiety and depression.

*Generalised self - efficacy* is a stable trait, which is related to an individuals' belief in their own ability and their ability to mobilise their motivation, cognitive resources and specific actions to meet demands of specific situations. Generalised self - efficacy increases with experiences of personal success and is determined by the level of task difficulty, an individual believes they can attain. The strength of this conviction and the ability to achieve this extends over a wide range of activities and situations. The literature has defined and identified the four major sources of self - efficacy beliefs as being enactive mastery, modelling, social persuasion and psychological states.

*Locus of control*, as a concept was defined as originating from the social learning and attribution theories. This refers to an individual's belief regarding their behaviour and the outcomes thereof. In the literature, locus of control was conceptualised as a continuum, with internal control being at the lower end of the continuum, and external control being at the upper end of the continuum. The individual with a high internal locus of control believes that events and results thereof in their lives are the result of their own internal attributes. Individuals with an external locus of control are of the belief that outcomes in their lives are beyond their control. Individuals with an internal locus of control, experience situations within their work context, as being within their control and find they are able to handle the demands of the environment.

Rothmann (2000) found positive correlations to exist between internal locus of control and sense of coherence, sense of coherence and generalised self - efficacy and between internal locus of control and generalised self - efficacy (Rothmann).

### **5.1.2 Conclusions regarding the specific empirical objectives**

Statistical analyses confirmed the internal consistency of the four measuring instruments employed in this research.

The second specific objective was, to determine the levels of leadership styles, sense of coherence, locus of control and generalised self - efficacy of managers in an organisation. It was found, that the research group perceives their own level of leadership as being more transformational than transactional or laissez-faire. They further presented below average levels of sense of coherence and locus of control.

Lastly, it was found that the research group leans toward an external locus of control, implying that they tend to view the outcomes of their behaviour as being beyond their control, rather than being the result of internal attributes.

The third specific objective, was to determine differences in leadership styles, sense of coherence, locus of control and generalised self - efficacy with regard to language, age, gender, education and tenure of managers and supervisors within an organisation. A marked correlation was found between the level of education, namely, graduate qualifications and 'other' qualifications and levels of self - efficacy. Those with a degree experienced lower self - efficacy in the work context than those who had other qualifications such as electrical or technical qualifications. This corresponds with findings of Bandura (1986) who found that leaders who experienced high levels of self - efficacy as being more determined, successful and effective in their experience as opposed to those who had a low self - efficacy. It was also found that participants with longer periods of service to the company (tenure), tended to experience transactional styles of leadership behaviour as opposed to those who had worked within the company for less than five years, being more transformational leaders. Furthermore, a high correlation was found between self - efficacy and level of education, where participants with tertiary or post graduate qualifications experiencing lower levels of self - efficacy than do their counterparts who have other more 'technical' orientated qualifications for example; being a qualified electrician, technical expert. Bandura (1997) found that the level of mastery of skill and experience influences levels of self - efficacy in leaders.

The fourth specific objective was to determine the relationship between leadership styles on the one hand and sense of coherence, locus of control and generalised self - efficacy, on the

other hand. A practically significant relationship was found to exist between transformational leadership styles and self - efficacy which concurs with the research done by Schwarzer and Mueller (1999). No significant relationship was, however, established between leadership styles and sense of coherence and leadership styles and locus of control (which is contrary to the findings of Salter, 1999).

The final specific objective, was to determine whether leadership styles can predict sense of coherence, generalised self - efficacy and work locus of control. In this research, leadership styles and locus of control were found not to be correlated. Leadership styles were found to predict sense of coherence and self - efficacy to a certain extent. Canonical correlations revealed, that leadership styles predicts some variance in the psychological strengths measured in this study, but not a significant amount.

## **5.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH**

The following limitations can be identified in this study.

- The entire population could not complete the measuring battery on one occasion and were provided with questionnaires to complete in their own time. The questionnaires were confidential, thus participants were not required to identify themselves and consequently not all questionnaires were returned and it could not be determined which questionnaires were outstanding. The total population in this study was 216, however only 39,8% of the questionnaires were returned, of which one was incorrectly completed.
- Only one organisation was used in this research, which raises the possibility of a specific organisational culture, influencing responses.
- The Multi-Factor leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is generally completed as part of a 360 degree evaluation by superiors, peers and subordinates. For the purposes of this study the MLQ was completed by Managers or leaders, as a 'self-assessment' of their perceptions of their own leadership style. This may then have resulted in a 'halo-effect' whereby leaders responses were 'more positive' than they in fact should have been.
- A further explanation for the exaggerated 'positive results' mentioned above may be due to the fact that the results of the study would be linked to performance outcomes and this may also have potentially skewed results.

- The research group was relatively unequal in terms of the number of male and female participants, significant differences exist between these two groups in terms of their self-assessment of their leadership style as indicated by Alimo -Metcalf and Alimo -Metcalf (2000). Furthermore, only 10 females partook in the study, whereas 76 males took part. Diversity among the respondents could have influenced the results.
- An additional problem with self-report questionnaires is that the results may be influenced by expectations of the research outcome by participants. This limitation is especially pertinent when subjects know the aim of the research. Although the covering letter avoided an explanation of the specific nature of the study beyond that it aimed to examine the area of leadership, the items were rather transparent and the subjects may have inferred the aim of the study.
- A final measurement concern is that certain scales used in the present study were designed for overseas samples and have not been validated on a South African sample. Other cultures may be rather different from those that exist in South Africa and may have led to participants misinterpreting the questions (Huysamen, 1993). However, the use of the locus of control scales in previous South African studies, with psychometric acceptability, suggest that these scales were suitable for inclusion in the present study.

### **5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations are made with regard to the applicable organisation, as well as in regard of future research.

#### **5.3.1 Recommendations for the organisation**

Firstly, the mean score obtained by the participants in this study, indicates a high perceived level of transformational leadership, however this has also been shown to be affected by levels of tenure. Participants employed by the organisation for five years and less are more transformational as opposed to those employed longer than five years being more transactional leaders. This implies that while the level of leadership styles in this company is not extreme, the level of transformational leadership needs to be promoted and encouraged. Alimo - Metcalfe and Alimo - Metcalfe (2000) proposed introducing more gender friendly leadership ratios of the female executive.

Secondly, the research group presented high levels of self - efficacy, above average levels of sense of coherence and a tendency towards an external locus of control. External locus of control has been positively correlated with stress, absenteeism and turnover (Spector, 1982) and a negative correlation with job satisfaction (Rothmann, 2000; Spector). As noted, external control employees may be more competent to deal with frustrations in the organisation by drawing or reacting aggressively (Spector). The organisation may find it worthwhile to invest in stimulating an internal locus of control amongst leaders. A person, with an internal locus of control, sees a direct cause and consequence between his behaviour and the consequences thereof. Reinforcing behaviour in this way, whereby leaders can see a link between their behaviour and the consequences thereof, stimulates an internal locus of control environment.

A relationship between transformational leadership and self - efficacy was established, and consequently the organisation may find it beneficial to stimulate leaders self - efficacy. With regard to self - efficacy it was noted that leaders with shorter periods of service to the company were more transformational leaders as opposed to those who had been employed for longer periods and in addition the more transformational the leader, the higher the self - efficacy. Self - efficacy is related to a person's beliefs regarding individual abilities and can therefore, be stimulated by creating an environment where leaders receive feedback and reinforcement to improve their personal confidence levels. The General Self - efficacy Scale, according to Bandura (1986) can be used for screening people at risk for coping deficiencies. Appelbaum and Hare (1996) noted that in order for self - efficacy to be improved, before, during and after training; specific information regarding tasks, complexity and the environment; the way in which these may be controlled and information regarding specific task demands, need to be communicated. This, according to Appelbaum and Hare provides the basis for optimal self - efficacy. It is suggested that this information be provided as part of the training process, through modelling, feedback and reinforcement.

### **5.3.2 Recommendations for further research**

Firstly, the relationship between leadership styles and other psychological strengths, as well as work-related outcomes, must be researched. Secondly, research on leadership styles and psychological strengths, must also take place within a wide range of organisations. Thirdly, larger research groups must be used and qualitative research into leadership styles might

deliver a more representative depiction of the presence of gender differences in transformational and transactional leader. Lastly, a more comprehensive, multidimensional measure of leadership styles must be applied.

#### **5.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In this chapter conclusions regarding the theoretical and empirical objectives were made. The limitations of the research were pointed out and recommendations were made for the organisation in which the study took place, as well as for future research. All theoretical and empirical objectives formulated for this research, have been attained.

#### **5.5 CONCLUSION**

On measures of transactional, transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles, which were designed to predict effectiveness, yet another pattern appeared. Female leaders exceeded male leaders on the female-stereotypic transformational dimension of individualised consideration and scored higher than men on two additional subscales of transformational leadership as well as on the contingent reward scale. In contrast, men exceeded woman on the active and passive-management-by-exception and laissez-faire subscales. It is likely that the greater effectiveness of female than male leaders in this sample of managers reflected the negative relationships of the passive-by-management and laissez-faire scales to effectiveness and the positive relationships of the transformational and contingent reward styles to effectiveness.

Based on existing evidence, it was suggested that two underlying processes may be influential on leadership styles, namely; (1) the spill over of the female and male gender roles onto leadership behaviour and (2) the prejudice woman may encounter in leadership roles, especially if these roles are male-dominated or if woman behave in an especially masculine style. One manifestation is the belief that woman operate on a double standard whereby they have to meet a higher standard of effectiveness to attain leadership roles and to attain them over time.

Finally, the aspects of these findings have the clearest implications for the effectiveness of female and male leaders pertaining to transformational, transactional and laissez-faire styles.

Women's more transformational style and greater use of contingent reward as well as their lesser use of passive-management-by-exception and laissez-faire, should enhance organisational effectiveness (Yoder, cited in Alimo - Metcalfe & Alimo - Metcalfe, 2000). These findings thus resonate the possibility that woman are better managers than men. For example, an article in Business Week suggests that "after years of analysing what makes leaders most effective and figuring out who's got the Right Stuff, management gurus now know how to boost the odds of getting a great executive: Hire a female" (Sharpe, cited in Alimo-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe, 2000). Woman's advantages in leadership style may sometimes be encountered, however, by reluctance, particularly on the part of men, to give woman power over others in work settings. Social and organisational changes place woman, more often than men, in the position of being newer entrants into higher level managerial roles. As newcomers, woman may reflect contemporary trends in management (Fondas, cited in Alimo-Metcalfe & Alimo-Metcalfe, 2000), including an emphasis on transformational leadership, that may threaten older, more established managers. A reluctance to allow woman to ascend in the organisation may reflect a resistance to changing managerial styles and also reflects a prejudicial tendency to evaluate woman's leadership behaviour less positively to men (Eagly, 2000). Overall, however research on leadership reflects very positively on the future of female managers in the ranks of leader.

## REFERENCE LIST

- Abrams, D. (1985). Leadership Today. *People Management*, 80(2), 67-88.
- Alimo - Metcalfe, R.J. & Alimo - Metcalfe, B. (2000). An analysis of the convergent and discriminant validity of the Transformational Leadership Questionnaire. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8(3), 71-75.
- Antonovsky, A. (1979). *Health, stress and coping: New perspectives on mental and physical well-being*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Antonovsky, A. (1993). The structure and properties of the sense of coherence scale. *Social Science and Medicine*, 36, 725-733.
- Antonovsky, A. (1996). The salutogenic model as a theory to guide health promotion. *Health Promotion International*, 11, 11-19.
- Appelbaum, S.H. & Hare, A. (1996). Self-efficacy as a mediator of goal setting and performance: Some human resource applications. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11(3), 33-47.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Effective leadership in a team. *Psychological Review*, 73, 129-133.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behaviour change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Barker, B. (2001). Do leaders matter? *Educational Review*, 53, 210-220.
- Barling, A., Weber, G. & Kelloway, D. (1996). *Adapting to leadership change in a global market*. NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership: Performance beyond expectations*. NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990a). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990b). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1999). Re-examining the concepts of transformational and transactional leadership and afro-centric management. *Human resource management*, 11(6), 17-21.
- Bass, B.M. & Stogdill, S. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). NY: Free Press.

- Bennis, W. (1997). Leaders of leaders: Executive excellence. *Journal of work and Organization, 14*(2), 24-38.
- Booyesen, L. & Beaty, D.T. (1997). Linking transformation and change in South Africa: A review of principles and practices. *Research Review, 1*, 9-18.
- Bothma, A.C., & Schepers, J.M (1997). The role of locus of control and achievement motivation in the work performance of Black Managers. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 23*(3), 44-52.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. & Leone, C. (1997). Assessing contingency, power, and efficacy: A psychometric investigation of social motivation. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137*(2), 255-265.
- Coetzee, S.C. & Rothmann, S. (1999). Die verband tussen koherensiesin en werkstevredenheid by bestuurders. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 25*(3), 31-38.
- Cohen, S.N. (1990). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Eagly, F. (2000). Gender influences on Leadership behaviour. *Journal of Organisational Psychology, 20*, 399-355.
- Feldt, T. (1997). The role of sense of coherence in well-being at work: Analysis of main and moderator effects. *Work and Stress, 11*, 134-147.
- Feldt, T. & Rasku, A. (1998). The structure of Antonovsky's Orientation to Life Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 505-516.
- Gardner, D.G. & Pierce, J.L. (1998). Self-esteem and self-efficacy within the organizational context: An empirical examination. *Group and Organization Management, 23*, 48-70.
- Goodwin, V.L. (2001). Transformational leadership, goal difficulty, and task design: Independent and interactive effects of employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 21*(2), 230-332.
- House, A. (1970). Personal Behavioural Theories. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 44*, 229-300.
- House, A. (1971). The influence of Leadership: An investigative study. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 20*, 190.
- Howell, J.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(6), 891-902.
- Huysamen, G.K. (1993). *Metodologie vir die sosiale en gedragwetenskappe*. Halfway House, Jhb: Southern.

- Jacobs, L.M. (1970). Transactional leadership: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 19, 151-188.
- Kalimo, R. & Vuori, J. (1990). Work and sense of coherence: Resources for competence and life satisfaction. *Behavioural Medicine*, 16, 76-77.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1998). *Foundations of behavioural research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). NY: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.
- Kotter, J. (1998). Management of the Future. *The Harvard Business Review*, 48, 332-338.
- Kreitner & Kinicki (1999). *Organizational Behaviour* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). NY: Prentice Hall.
- Metcalfe, R.J. & Metcalfe, B.A. (2000). An analysis of the convergent and discriminant validity of the transformational leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 8(3), 158.
- Mouton, J. & Marais, H. C. (1992). *Basiese begrippe: Metodologie van die geesteswetenskappe*. Pretoria: RGN.
- Plug, C., Louw, D.A., Gouws, L.A. & Meyer, W.F. 1997. Verklarende en vertalende sielkundewoordeboek. Jhb: Heinemann.
- Paglis, L. & Green, S. (2002). Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 23, 215-235.
- Prussia, G.E., Anderson, J.S. & Manz, C.C (1998). Self-leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 19, 523-538.
- Robbins, S. (2001). *Organizational Theories and Behaviour* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). NY: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. & Burns, P. (2000). *Leadership styles and traits*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rothmann, S. (2000, July). *Sense of coherence, locus of control self - efficacy and job satisfaction*. Paper presented at the 28<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Psychology, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Salter, J. (1999). Self-efficacy and sense of coherence of senior managers in a service organisation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 111-119.
- Saunders, E. (2000). *Assessing human competence: Practical guidelines for the South African manager*. Randburg, Jhb: Knowledge Resources.
- Schwarzer, R. & Mueller, J. (1999). Assessment of perceived general self - efficacy on the internet: Data collection in cyberspace. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 12(2), 145-161.
- Schwarzer, R. (2001). Social-cognitive factors in changing health-related behaviours. *American Psychological Society*, 4(2), 47-51.

- Shaughnessy, J.J. & Zechmeister, E.B. (1997). *Research methods in psychology* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Sherer, M. & Maddux, J.E. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663-671.
- Smith, P.B. & Dugan, S. (1995). The Rotter Locus of Control Scale in 43 countries: A test of cultural relativity. *Journal of Psychology, 30*(3), 377-400.
- Spector, P.E. (1982). Behaviour in organizations as a function of locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin, 91*, 482-497.
- Spector, P.E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61*, 335-340.
- Strümpfer, D.J.W. (1990). Salutogenesis: A new paradigm. *South African Journal of Psychology, 20*, 265-276.
- Strümpfer, D.J.W. (1995). The origins of health and strength: From salutogenesis to fortigenesis. *South African Journal of Psychology, 25*, 81-89.
- Strümpfer, D.J.W. & Mlonzi, E.N. (2001). Antonovsky's sense of coherence scale and job attitudes: Three Studies. *South African Journal of Psychology, 31*(2), 30-35.
- Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, P.N. (1973). *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Yukl, G.A. (1991). *Leadership in organisations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.