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ABSTRACT

There is accumulating evidence that transformational leadership influences employee motivation and performance both individually and collectively (Dansereau et al 1995, Avolio and Bass 1995, Yammarino et al 1998). Previous studies have mainly treated transformational leadership as an overarching construct focusing on the individual and group levels of analysis separately. Understanding the underlying process of different behavioural components of transformational leadership at both the individual and group levels is theoretically and practically important (Yukl 1998, Kark and Shamir 2002, van Knippenberg et al 2004). Theoretically, examining behavioural components provides clarity as to how transformational leadership affects individuals and groups (Wu et al 2010). Practically, it provides important managerial implications for adapting appropriate sets of transformational leadership behaviours to manage teams and individuals effectively (Chen et al 2007). Recognizing the important implications of this line of research and extending the results of current research, this study focuses on the effects of the behavioural components of transformational leadership and examines the influence process of each transformational leadership behavioural component at its designated level.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the underlying mechanism that enables transformational leadership to affect individual and collective levels of behaviours. The behavioural dimensions of individual-focused and group-focused transformational leadership are first defined and described. Drawing on social cognitive theory, self-concept theory and a target similarity framework, this study then proposes a model of the underlying process via which behavioural components of transformational leadership influence individual and group outcomes. Self and collective efficacies, which reflect the characteristics of personal and collective
efficacy beliefs, are proposed as mechanisms that underpin the dual-level effects of transformational leadership on the outcomes. Specifically, I theorize that individual-focused and group-focused transformational leadership behaviours are positively related to personal efficacy and collective efficacy respectively. I further hypothesize that individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours positively influence individual level work outcomes through the mediating effect of personal efficacy. At the group level, I hypothesize that group-focused transformational leadership behaviours positively influence group level work outcomes through the mediating effect of collective self-efficacy.

A pilot study is conducted to confirm that individual- and group-focused transformational leadership behaviours are distinct. The transformational leadership scale from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) form 5x is adopted with wording revised to represent group-focused and individual-focused referents. The items are validated via a sample of 77 postgraduate students enrolled in Business Management programs in China and Australia. The model is then tested with data from a sample of 297 subordinates and 100 supervisors, which represent 100 work teams, in a major hotel in Southern China. Results provide support for the model, showing that self-efficacy mediates the effect of individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours on individual performance and career expectation at the individual level. Collective self-efficacy also mediates the effect of group-focused transformational leadership behaviours on group performance and organizational citizenship behaviours at the group level. Implications for theory and practice are discussed and the limitations of the current study for future research directions are outlined.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Social Cognitive Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE</td>
<td>Organizational-based Self Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>Intra-class correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours</th>
<th>Individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours refer to leaders’ behaviours that aim to empower individual followers to develop their full potential, enhance their abilities and skills, and improve self-efficacy and self-esteem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-focused transformational leadership behaviours</td>
<td>Group-focused transformational leadership behaviours refer to leaders’ behaviours that target at the group as a whole. These behaviours communicate the importance of group goals, develop shared values and beliefs and inspire unified efforts to achieve groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-efficacy</td>
<td>Personal self-efficacy is defined as ‘individuals’ belief in their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance’ (Bandura 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective self-efficacy</td>
<td>Collective self-efficacy is defined as ‘a group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments’ (Bandura 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Expectation</td>
<td>This is defined as the perception of the likelihood of an individual’s advancement in the organization in which they are employed (Scandura and Schriesheim 1991).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
<td>This is defined as ‘individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization’ (Organ 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of analysis</td>
<td>This refers to the unit to which the data are assigned for hypothesis testing and analysis (Rousseau 1985).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-level variable</td>
<td>“Group-level variables” variables characterise groups (for example, group-focused transformational leadership behaviours, collective self-efficacy). (Duncan et al 1992).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-level variable</td>
<td>“Individual-level” variables characterise individuals and refer to individual level constructs (for example, individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours, personal self-efficacy). (Duncan et al 1992).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The $r_{wg}$ measure is used in assessing the level of inter-rater agreement of group-level constructs within workgroups. This agreement means that reliability of the constructs takes into account differences within workgroups relative to differences between workgroups (James et al. 1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$r_{wg}$</th>
<th>The $r_{wg}$ measure is used in assessing the level of inter-rater agreement of group-level constructs within workgroups. This agreement means that reliability of the constructs takes into account differences within workgroups relative to differences between workgroups (James et al. 1984).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intra-class correlation</td>
<td>Intra-class correlation (ICC) refers to correlation values that reflect the within-group agreement of the constructs (Bliese, 2000). There are two forms of ICC values. ICC (1) represents the proportion of variance due to team variability. ICC (2) reflects the extent to which teams can be used to reliably differentiate in terms of individuals’ ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kappa coefficient</td>
<td>The Kappa coefficient measures the agreement between two raters who each classify N items into C mutually exclusive categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: RESEARCH OVERVIEW

1.1 Introduction

Evidence has been accumulating that transformational leadership (TFL) influences the motivation and performance of individual followers and subordinate groups as a whole (Dansereau et al 1995, Avolio and Bass 1995, Yammarino et al 1998). Previous studies have mainly treated TFL as an overarching construct focusing on the individual and group levels of analysis separately (Ellemers et al 2004, Burke et al 2006, Kearney and Gebert 2009). Recently, researchers have begun to focus on the behavioural components of TFL in an attempt to understand their different effects on individual and group outcomes (Kark and Shamir 2002, Wu et al 2010, Wang and Howell 2010, van Knippenberg et al 2004, van Knippenberg et al 2013).

Understanding the underlying process of different behavioural components of TFL at both the individual and group levels is theoretically and practically important. As Yukl (1998) suggests, different TFL behaviours may involve different influence processes and so achieve different outcomes. Kark and Shamir (2002) and van Knippenberg et al (2004, 2013) call for more research to examine which components of leadership behaviours affect individual and group-level attitudes and behaviours respectively. Van Knippenberg et al (2013) state that there is lack of theory to specify the causal model capturing how each dimension of transformational leadership has a distinct influence on mediating processes and outcome. Examining behavioural components of TFL is theoretically important not only because it provides clarity as to how TFL affects individuals and groups (Wu et al 2010), but it also has important managerial implications for leveraging resources to manage teams and individuals effectively (Chen et al 2007).
1.2 Research Background

Recognizing the important implications of this line of research, Kark and Shamir (2002) propose a dual-level TFL framework to examine the behavioural dimensions of TFL. This framework suggests different leadership behaviours can account for the different levels of effects of TFL. According to Kark and Shamir (2002), TFL behaviours can be distinguished as individual-focused and group-focused. Individual-focused TFL behaviours refer to behaviours aiming to empower individual followers to develop their full potential, enhance their abilities and skills, and improve self-efficacy and self-esteem. Group-focused TFL behaviours refer to behaviours aiming to communicate the importance of group goals, develop shared values and beliefs and inspire unified efforts to achieve those goals. Based on the Bass (1985) model of transformational leadership, two behavioural components of TFL – idealized influence and inspirational motivation – aim to influence the group as a whole. They are referred as group-focused TFL behaviours. The other two components of TFL – individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation – focus on the uniqueness of each follower. They are referred as individual-focused TFL behaviours.

In terms of group-level analysis, Wu et al (2010) adopt Kark and Shamir’s (2002) dual-level TFL framework and reveal that varying levels of individual-focused TFL behaviours within groups diminishes group effectiveness. Wang and Howell (2010) expand the Kark and Shamir (2002) framework and define individual-focused TFL behaviours to consist of four dimensions of individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, high expectations and personal recognition; while group-focused TFL behaviours consist of three dimensions of idealized influence, inspirational motivation and team building. Their results reveal that individual-focused TFL behaviours are positively related to individual task performance and personal initiative, while group-
focused TFL behaviours are positively associated with group performance and helping behaviour. These studies represent important steps toward understanding how the behavioural components of TFL influence individual and group work outcomes.

1.3 Theoretical Framework and Research Questions

This study aims to further the results of previous research on the dual level effects of TFL behaviours. To understand the dual-level effects of TFL, it is helpful to delve into the mechanism through which behavioural components of TFL are related to individual and group outcomes. By contrasting different levels conceptually and testing them relative to one another in the same study, we aim to draw clearer conclusions about associations and the levels at which behavioural components of TFL operate, as suggested by Yammarino et al (1998).

Drawing on social cognitive theory, self-concept theory and the target similarity framework, this study develops and tests a mediated model to examine the underlying process through which individual-focused and group-focused behavioural components of TFL are related to individual and group outcomes. The model of the relationships proposed in the present research is summarized in Figure 1. Specifically, it is proposed that individual-focused TFL behaviours influence individual performance and career expectation through the mediation of personal self-efficacy at the individual level. Group-focused TFL behaviours influence group performance and group organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) through the mediation of collective self-efficacy at the group level.

The research presented addresses two questions that are important to advance our understanding of the dual-level effects of TFL behaviours. First, which behavioural
dimensions of TFL are individual-focused making people in leadership positions effective in motivating and inspiring followers and which are group-focused, motivating followers’ behaviour in pursuit of collective objectives? Second, what are the distinctive processes that enable TFL behavioural components to influence work outcomes at the individual level and the group level?

1.4 Research Design and Scope

This thesis consists of two studies which focus on understanding the effects of TFL behaviours at the individual and the group levels.

Study 1 is a focus group study conducted to confirm the distinction between individual- and group-focused TFL behaviours. Following Wu et al (2010), the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5x) is adopted. The TFL items are validated via a sample of 77 postgraduate students enrolled in Business Management programs, confirming that TFL behaviours can be distinguished as individual-focused and group-focused.

Study 2 is to test the mediating process of TFL behaviours at the individual and group levels. It is conducted using a cross-sectional design in a major hotel in Southern China which has more than 1,000 employees. Data is from 100 supervisors and 297 employees, representing 100 work teams. The model is then tested with data from a valid sample of 97 supervisor-subordinate dyads. Structural equation modeling (SEM) with statistical software LISREL 8.8 (Joreskog and Sorbom 2001) is performed to test the fit of the model.

The following table (Table 1.1) presents a summary of the two studies.
### Table 1.1: Summary of Studies 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Research Methods and Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 1</strong></td>
<td>Focus group study with a sample of 77 postgraduate students enrolled in Business Management programs in Australia and China. Survey was developed to collect data and responses. Analysis focussed on perceptions of individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chapter 4)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 2</strong></td>
<td>This is based on a larger scale quantitative survey, with a sample of 397 employees representing 100 work teams, in a large five-star hotel in Southern China. The survey was conducted using a cross-sectional design. Manager-reported and self-reported measures were used to collect the data. These were analysed to test hypotheses regarding the individual-level relationships between individual-focused TFL behaviours, personal self-efficacy, individual performance and individual career expectation. Data were aggregated to test hypotheses concerning group-level relationships between group-focused TFL behaviours, collective self-efficacy, group organizational citizenship behaviour and group performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chapter 5)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Contributions of the Study

The study makes several theoretical and practical contributions.

First, while the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5x) has been used in TFL research at the individual and group levels, and Wu et al (2010) adopt MLQ to measure group-focused and individual-focused TFL behaviours, the validity of the items to be distinguished as individual-focused and group-focused behaviours has not been tested. Here a focus group is used to assess study to assess this validity.

Second, our study sheds some light on the mechanisms through which the effects of individual- and group-focused TFL behavioural components are manifested. Wu et al’s (2010) study only conceptualized and tested their hypothesized relationships using group-level analysis. Although Wang and Howell (2010) tested both individual- and group-level effects of TFL behaviours, they did not go further to examine the mechanism that underpins the relationships. Hence, examining intervening mechanisms is a promising way to advance this line of research. This responds to the call to examine behavioural components of TFL to provide clarity as to how TFL behaviours affect individuals and groups (Kark and Shamir 2002, van Knippenberg et al 2004, van Knippenberg et al 2013).

Third, the work contributes to multifocal research by identifying and separating intended beneficiaries of TFL and measuring the effects specific to each target. This responds to the call for research with ‘source specifications among antecedents, mediators and outcomes’ (Lavelle et al 2007).

Finally, by understanding the direct and indirect effects of transformational leadership behaviours, leaders are able to adopt different strategies for individual and group work results.
1.6 Thesis Overview

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the research background, theoretical framework, research questions and research design. In Chapter 2, a review of the literature on transformational leadership, individual-focused TFL and group-focused TFL is provided. The underlying theory of social cognitive theory, self-concept theory and target similarity framework, which guide and underpin the model and hypothesis development, is discussed in Chapter 3. The related constructs of self-esteem, organizational-based self-esteem, collective self-esteem and group potency are also covered. Finally, Chapter 3 provides an explanation of the theoretical model and hypothesis development in this thesis. By integrating the social cognitive theory, self-concept theory and target similarity framework, the interrelationship between the study variables are established so as to constitute the model.

Six hypotheses are formulated to address the second research question of this thesis. Hypotheses 1 and 2 concern the direct relationships between individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours and efficacy beliefs at both the individual and collective level respectively. Hypotheses 3 to 6 focus on the mediating role of efficacy beliefs between the individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours and work outcomes at the individual and group level. Chapter 4 is a focus group study to address the first research question of this thesis. The Chapter reports the results of a survey which aimed to validate a distinction between individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours via a measuring scale. Survey data was collected and analysed to contribute to the conceptual development of individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours.

Chapter 5 presents the main quantitative study, to examine the relationship between individual-focused TFL behaviours, personal efficacy and work outcomes at the
individual level, and the relationship between group-focused TFL behaviours, collective self-efficacy and work outcomes at the group level. Hypotheses 1 to 6 were tested in this study and their results reported correspondingly. Chapter 6 presents a summary of results and a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of the study. Limitations and directions for future research are also discussed. An overall thesis conclusion is included in Chapter 7.

1.7 Conclusion

This chapter serves as the introduction to this thesis. It clarifies the origins of the research topic, and identifies the associated issues arising in the literature. The theoretical model used is outlined along with the research to which it is applied. In addition, the research design and scope of each of the two studies for this thesis is summarised. Finally, the contributions of this research and the thesis overview are presented.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of the literature regarding the main constructs in the study – individual-focused TFL behaviours and group-focused TFL behaviours. The focus is on presenting the existing body of relevant research associated with the constructs. Also incorporated are definitions and a research review of similar and related constructs of self-esteem, organizational-based self-esteem, collective self-esteem and group potency. In addition, there is a description of the underlying theories of social cognitive theory, self-concept theory and the target similarity framework that underpin the research model developed in this thesis.

2.1. Transformational Leadership

Since the late 1970s, multiple theories of transformational and charismatic leadership have been proposed in the leadership literature (Bass 1985, Burns 1978, House 1977, Conger and Kanungo 1987, 1998, Shamir et al 1993). Burns’ (1978) book entitled Leadership has influenced much of the research and writing. In it, transformational leadership is defined as appealing to the moral values of followers in an attempt to raise their consciousness about ethical issues and to mobilize their energy and resources to reform institutions. These leaders shift the beliefs, the needs and the values of followers and share ‘higher’ collective goals, values and interests.

2.1.1 Theories of Transformational and Charismatic Leadership

Different theories of transformational and charismatic leadership have emerged since Burns (1978). Some of the dominant ones are described below.
**Bass’ (1985) Model of Transformational Leadership**

Bass (1985) extended Burn’s (1978) theory of transformational leadership. According to Bass (1985), transformational leaders’ attempt to, and succeed in, raising colleagues, subordinates, followers, clients, or constituencies to a greater awareness about issues of consequence. Transformational leaders influence subordinates by broadening and elevating followers’ goals and providing them with confidence to perform beyond the expectations specified in the implicit or explicit exchange agreement. Transformational leaders recognize individual differences in terms of needs and desires. They pay attention to each individual’s need for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor. They offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. Followers are given new learning opportunities in a supportive environment to develop higher levels of potential (Bass 1985 and also Dvir et al 2002).

Bass (1985) distinguish four dimensions of transformational leadership behaviours. These dimensions are charismatic leadership, inspirational leadership, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation. Charisma or idealized influence refers to leaders’ behaviours that are admired, respected and trusted. Followers identify with, and want to imitate, their leaders. Leaders earn respect from followers by considering their needs over his or her own. Leaders share risks with followers and are consistent in conduct with principles and values. Inspirational motivation refers to leaders who motivate followers by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work. Followers display enthusiasm and optimism. Individual and team spirit is aroused. A leader who motivates by inspiration encourages followers to visualise attractive future states, which they can ultimately envision for themselves.
Intellectual stimulation refers to leaders who question assumptions, reframe problems and approach old situations in new ways in order to stimulate followers to be innovative and creative. Leaders do not criticize individual members’ mistakes in public. Followers are included in the process of addressing problems and finding solutions. They are encouraged to present new ideas and creative solutions to problems. Individualized consideration refers to leaders who act as coaches or mentors to followers and pay individual attention to their need for achievement and growth. Such leaders create a supportive climate for new learning opportunities and for developing higher levels of potential. They understand and recognize individual differences in terms of needs and desires.

**Conger and Kanungo’s (1987) Model of Charismatic Leadership**

Conger and Kanungo (1987) propose a model of charismatic leadership that is attribution based. Charismatic leadership is an attribution phenomenon based on followers’ perceptions of their leader’s behaviours as expressions of charisma. Leaders’ behaviours that are perceived by followers as charismatic are not oriented to maintain the status quo, instead they constantly reformulate vision. They are sensitive to environment and followers’ needs, willing to take personal risk and they tend to deploy unconventional behaviours.

Charismatic leadership process has three stages. First, the environmental assessment stage has charismatic leaders seeking to change the status quo in a manner that is sensitive to environmental opportunities, constraints and followers’ needs. Second, the vision formulation stage sees leaders formulate a shared and idealized future vision and articulate this vision to followers in an inspirational manner. Leaders are
perceived as charismatic as the vision formulated is seen as shared and satisfying followers’ needs. Third is the implementation stage, where leaders are seen as taking personal risk and self-sacrificing to achieve the shared vision. Thus, they are perceived to be adopting innovative and unconventional means to achieve the shared vision. Through the perception as being charismatic, leaders are able to empower followers and build trust.

Although the Conger-Kanungo model (1987) focuses on charisma, which is just one of the four components of the Bass (1985) model of transformational leadership, the two models appear to overlap in several aspects. The behavioural component of sensitivity to follower needs in the Conger-Kanungo model (1987) requires followers to perceive leaders’ attention to their needs. This is similar to the individualized consideration dimension of the Bass (1985) model by which the leader pays attention to followers’ needs for achievement and growth.

That followers perceive the leader to formulate a shared vision in an inspirational manner is a key behavioural component in the Conger-Kanungo model (1987). This is similar to the charisma dimension in Bass (1985) model by which followers identify with and want to follow their leaders. The dimension of charisma in Bass (1985) model refers also to leaders’ risk-sharing behaviour. This is similar to the behavioural dimensions of taking personal risks and making personal sacrifice in the Conger-Kanungo (1987) model. The dimension of intellectual stimulation in Bass (1985) model refers to behaviours that stimulate followers’ effort to be innovative and creative. This dimension overlaps with the behavioural component of unconventional behaviour in the Conger-Kanungo (1987) model, by which leaders are seen to be deploying innovative and unconventional means to achieve their visions.

This is based on self-concept theory and it seeks to explain the transformational effects of charismatic leadership. The authors suggest that charismatic leaders achieve transformational effects through engaging the self-concept of followers in the interest of the mission articulated by the leader. According to the theory, charismatic behaviours 'raise the salience of certain values and identities in followers’ self-concepts and frame a group’s mission and followers’ roles in terms of those values and identities' (Shamir et al 1998). The effects on followers’ self-concepts of self-expression, self-esteem, self-worth and self-consistency change followers’ behaviours and activate other motivational mechanisms.

In this model there are four components of charismatic behaviours. They emphasize ideology and collective identity, along with the displaying of exemplary and supportive behaviours. Charismatic leaders emphasize collective values and ideologies. They link a mission, its outcomes and expected behaviours to these values and ideologies. By lowering power distance and emphasizing openness towards followers, charismatic leaders show sensitivity to followers’ needs and feelings. By articulating an ideological vision and displaying personal commitment to these values and goals, charismatic leaders provide followers with a sense of collective identity and create a sense of efficacy from collective membership. Through these behaviours, leaders activate followers’ motivational mechanisms of self-expression, self-consistency and self-enhancement and link followers to the leader and the work team.

The behavioural component of supportive behaviours in the Shamir et al model (1993) refers to leaders’ behaviours that minimizing their social and power distance from followers, enabling them to showing sensitivity to the needs of followers and providing followers with support and autonomy. This is similar to the individualized
consideration dimension in Bass's model, by which leaders pay attention to individual's needs and provide a supportive environment for individuals to grow.

In the Shamir et al. model, ideological emphasis and exemplary behaviours refer to leaders' attempts to connect group missions and tasks to broader values and goals. By this means they seek distinct collective identities at the group level. These behaviours are similar to the idealized influence dimension in Bass model, where leaders promote consistent vision and values amongst their followers. Leaders who exhibit idealized influence behaviour provide followers with a sense of meaning and challenge so followers also work to foster a sense of collectivity.

2.1.2 Work outcomes of Transformational Leadership at the Individual and Group Levels

The role of transformational leaders in enhancing individual and organizational performance is well documented (Bass 1990, Podsaff et al 1990). At the individual level, Judge and Piccolo (2004) conduct a meta-analysis of the relationship between transformational leader behaviour and effectiveness. They confirm the positive relationship between transformational leadership and follower job satisfaction, follower leader satisfaction and follower motivation. Previous research and meta-analyses have indicated a positive relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance (Howell and Avolio 1993, Lowe et al 1996). This research also shows that transformational leaders are more likely to exert their influence on followers by affecting their feelings of identification (Epitropaki and Martin 2005, Shamir et al 1993, Kark et al 2003, Conger et al 2000) and catering to followers' needs and competencies (Bycio et al 1995; Howell and Avolio 1993). It is
also found that transformational leadership behaviours positively enhance followers’ job perception (Shamir et al 1993, Bono and Judge 2004). Further, Piccolo and Colquitt (2006) find that transformational leadership affects task performance and organizational citizenship behaviour through the mediation of job characteristics, intrinsic motivation and goal commitment.

At the group level, Bass et al (2003) find that transformational leadership ratings of platoon leaders and sergeants in the U.S. army predicted unit performance in combat simulations. And Lim and Ployhart (2004) find that transformational leadership mediates the relationship between leadership personality and team performance. Similarly, Schaubroeck et al (2007) find that transformational leadership influences team performance through the mediating effect of team potency. Kearney and Gebert (2009) examine the moderating role of transformational leadership to understand its effects on the performance of diverse teams. They find that transformational leadership moderates the relationship of age, nationality and educational diversity with team performance. Kark et al (2003) also find a positive relationship between a general measure of transformational leadership and organization-based self-esteem, which is self-esteem specific to the organizational setting. They achieve this partially through social identification. Thus, the evidence from research to date supports the conclusion that transformational leadership positively relates to work outcomes at both individual and team levels.
2.2 The Constructs of Individual-focused and Group-focused Transformational Leadership

The self-concept based motivational theory of charismatic leadership (Shamir et al. 1993) and the self-concept based theory of leadership (Lord et al. 1999) both suggest that leaders achieve transformational effects by engaging the motivations for self-expression, self-esteem, self-worth and self-consistency. Activation of self-concept affects further motivational mechanisms, which have strong impact on the behaviours of followers. Kark and Shamir (2002) propose a TFL conceptual framework to explain the mechanisms underlying the dual-level effects of TFL. They suggest that TFL can prime the relational and collective levels of self-identity and ultimately affect followers' motivation and behaviours. The relational level of self-identity is based on interpersonal connections with specific others, such as the leader. The collective self is derived from membership in a work team or organization.

According to Kark and Shamir (2002), the key transformational behavioural components that prime followers' relational-self are individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. These two behaviours aim at influencing individual employees by focusing on individuals' needs, capabilities and affective states. Such leaders are highly aware of each person's unique skills and provide customized learning opportunities. They vary their behaviour depending on each follower's individual idiosyncrasies, thereby allowing the assignment of well-suited tasks. These transformational behaviours are thus individual-focused. Idealized influence and inspirational motivation are the key transformational behavioural components that are group-focused to prime the collective-self. Such leaders focus on the bond within the group as a whole and communicate high levels of confidence in the team's ability to achieve collective goals (Antonakis and House 2002). By emphasizing common
ground, stressing shared values and ideology, connecting followers’ personal goals and aims with the groups’ interests and interpreting present and past experiences of followers in terms of group values and identity (Shamir et al 1994), these behaviours prime the collective level of followers’ self-identity and foster individuals’ perception of belonging to the organization (Shamir et al 1993).

The Kark-Shamir (2002) concept of individual- and group-focused TFL behaviours is subsequently used by Wu et al (2010), who conduct a group-level study to examine the effectiveness of both group-focused and individual-focused leadership behaviours. Based on survey data from 70 work groups in eight companies, they find that group-focused TFL behaviours (idealized influence and inspirational stimulation) enhance group identification and collective efficacy, both of which also contribute positively to group effectiveness. They also find that varying levels of individual-focused TFL behaviours (individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation) among group members cause divergence between leader identification and self-efficacy beliefs, diminishing group effectiveness.

Similar to Kark and Shamir (2002) and Wu et al (2010), Wang and Howell (2010) define individual-focused TFL behaviours as behaviours aiming to empower individual followers to develop their full potential, enhance their abilities and skills, and improve self-efficacy and self-esteem. They define group-focused TFL behaviours as behaviours aiming to communicate the importance of group goals, develop shared values and beliefs and inspire unified efforts toward group achievement.

Different from Kark and Shamir (2002) and Wu et al (2010), however, Wang and Howell (2010) define individual- and group-focused TFL behaviours to consist of four and three dimensions respectively. In addition to individualized consideration
and intellectual stimulation, Wang and Howell (2010) include two additional dimensions of individual-focused TFL behaviours, namely high expectations and personal recognition. Thus, leaders convey to followers expectations of excellence and they praise and acknowledge followers for achieving specified goals or discovering new approaches.

For group-focused TFL behaviours, in addition to idealized influence and inspirational motivation, Wang and Howell (2010) include also team building as an additional dimension. Team building behaviours are defined as aiming at promoting cooperation, resolving frictions, and facilitating mutual trust among followers. Based on a survey sample of 203 members from 60 work groups in a Canadian company, their results reveal that individual-focused TFL behaviours are positively related to individual task performance and personal initiative, while group-focused TFL behaviours are positively associated with team performance and helping behaviour.

Consistent with Kark and Shamir (2002), Wu et al (2010) and Wang and Howell (2010), the focus in this thesis is on the behavioural components of TFL. It conceptualises individual-focused TFL as encompassing behaviours that concentrate on individual followers, empowering them to develop their full potential, enhance their abilities and skills and improve self-efficacy and self-esteem. Group-focused TFL encompasses behaviours that target the group as a whole and which communicate the importance of group goals, develop shared values and beliefs and inspire unified efforts to collective achievement. Consistent with previous research, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation are seen as individual-focused TFL behaviours and idealized influence and inspirational motivation as group-focused TFL behaviours. The influence target for individual-focused TFL
behaviours is individual and that for group-focused TFL behaviours is the work team or organisation.

2.3. Underlying Theories

2.3.1 Self-Concept Theory

Central to the self-concept and identity approach to leadership effectiveness is an understanding that the way we perceive ourselves strongly informs our feelings, beliefs, attitudes, goals and behaviours (Leary and Tangney 2003). Leadership that is able to influence follower self-conception may influence follower attitudes and behaviour (Lord et al 1999, Shamir et al 1993). Hence, follower self-conception may mediate the relationship between leadership and follower behaviour. Self-conception may differ in the level of inclusiveness at which the self is construed.

According to self-concept based theory (Shamir et al 1993), the charismatic leader is effective by strongly engaging followers’ self-concepts in the interest of the mission articulated by the leader. Specifically, according to the theory, charismatic leaders raise the salience of certain values and collective identities in followers’ self-concepts and articulate the goals and the required efforts in terms of those values and identities. Charismatic leaders achieve transformational effects by influencing the self-concepts of followers. These leaders increase the intrinsic value of efforts and goals by linking followers to valued aspects of the follower’s self-concept, thus harnessing the motivational forces of self-expression, self-consistency, self-esteem and self-worth (Shamir et al 1993). Thus, people are motivated to maintain and enhance their self-esteem and self-worth, where self-esteem embodies the senses of competence, power, achievement or ability to cope with and control one’s environment. Such leadership
behaviours change the salience of values and identities in followers’ self-concepts and are likely to shift followers’ behaviours from concern with individual gains to concern with contributions to a collective.

Lord et al (1999) adopt Brewer and Gardner’s (1996) theory and suggest that there are three levels of self: individual, interpersonal and collective. They further suggest that the effectiveness of specific leadership behaviours will depend on which of the follower’s self-concept levels is activated. Leaders will be most effective when their leadership processes are matched to predominant identity levels of followers. The individual level of self is based on self-worth that is derived from perceived similarities with and differences from others. At this level, leader’s behaviours that are specific to each follower have greatest effects. The interpersonal level of self is defined in terms of one’s relation to others, such as subordinate-leader. At this level, followers are motivated by congruent leadership behaviours and attitudes. The collective level of self is based on identification with a particular group such as work team or organization. At this level, leadership behaviours that provide group members with a common vision and framework from which to make decisions and set future goals tend to have the greatest effects on followers.

2.3.2 Social Cognitive Theory

Self-Efficacy

Social cognitive theory highlights self-efficacy as the key cognitive mechanism driving employees’ behaviours in a variety of circumstances (Bandura 1997). Self-efficacy is defined as ‘individuals’ belief in their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance’ (Bandura 1994). It has a positive impact on performance
because high levels of self-efficacy enable the effective regulation of human
behaviour through a range of cognitive, motivational, and affective decisional
processes (Bandura 1997). According to Gist and Mitchell (1992), self-efficacy has
three key characteristics. First, self-efficacy is a judgment of perceived capability to
complete a specific task. Second, this judgment of perceived efficacy changes over
time when skills and experience are acquired. Third, people who have the same skills
may perform differently depending on how the skills are utilized. Higher levels of
self-efficacy imply greater likelihood that individuals will engage and persist in
constructive tasks.

There are four primary sources of information on which individuals base their beliefs
about self-efficacy (Bandura 1982). These four primary sources are social persuasion,
their psychological state, their vicarious experience and their mastery experience.
Social persuasion refers to verbal persuasion by others that confirms the individual’s
ability to accomplish tasks. Psychological state refers to individuals’ aversive somatic
and emotional arousal related to performing tasks. Vicarious experience refers to the
experiences that individuals gain by observing and learning from social models,
especially those who are similar to them. Mastery experience refers to individuals’
past successful task accomplishment.

Collective Efficacy

Bandura (1986) originally defined efficacy at the individual level but later (Bandura
1997) introduced collective efficacy to extend social cognitive theory to the group
level of analysis. At the group level of analysis, collective efficacy is defined as ‘a
group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of
action required to produce given levels of attainment (Bandura 1997). It has been conceptualized as being similar to self-efficacy. Zaccaro et al (1995) define collective efficacy as ‘a sense of collective competence shared among individuals when allocating, coordinating and integrating their resources in a successful concerted response to specific situational demands. Collective efficacy is a shared belief that is task- and context-specific and that influences a group to initiate action, determine how much effort the group will exert and decide how long the group’s effort will be sustained.

**Relating Self Efficacy to Transformational Leadership**

Previous research has suggested that transformational leader behaviours may derive their effectiveness from links to follower self-efficacy at both the personal and collective levels of inclusiveness (Stajkovic et al 2009, Chen and Bliese 2002, Stajkovic and Luthans 1998, Conger and Kanungo 1998, Walumbwa et al 2004). At the individual level, transformational leadership is found to be positively related to employees’ perceptions of general self-efficacy (Pillai and Williams 2004). Walumbwa et al (2008) also find that self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and performance. Transformational leaders’ visions affect employee performance to the extent that they inspire or lead to the setting of specific goals, thereby raising self-efficacy (Kirkpatrick and Locke 1996). Such leaders alter followers’ beliefs in their capacity to perform and raise followers’ self-efficacy (Eden 1992, Conger and Kanungo 1998). Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) find that leaders’ visions affect employee performance to the extent that they inspire or lead to the setting of specific goals while at the same time raising self-efficacy.

At the group level, efficacy beliefs also play an important role in team motivation, simply because people have to rely on others to accomplish their tasks. Previous research and meta-analyses have shown collective self-efficacy to be positively related to group motivation and performance (Gully et al. 2002, Prussia and Kinicki 1996, Stajkovic et al. 2009). Chen et al. (2002) find that leadership climate is an immediate predictor of collective efficacy. Walumbwa et al. (2004) find that collective efficacy mediates transformational leadership and work withdrawal, and partially mediates transformational leadership, organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Although theoretical models of self-efficacy and collective efficacy (Lindsley et al. 1995) have suggested that the two constructs have similar antecedents and outcomes, empirical research has revealed both similarities and dissimilarities between individual-level and team-level antecedents and consequences of efficacy beliefs. Chen et al. (2002) find that efficacy is involved via mechanisms that differ as between the individual and group levels. They find that work experience, role clarity and psychological strain are important direct predictors of self-efficacy. Chen et al. (2002) test a multilevel model of efficacy beliefs. They find that, at the individual level, experience and achievement motivation are significant predictors of self-efficacy which positively predict individual performance. At the team level, however, team drive predicts collective efficacy but team expertise does not. This efficacy-performance result seems inconsistent, suggesting that predictors of self-efficacy do
not necessary predict collective efficacy, and vice versa (Chen et al 2002). The research result of Chen et al (2002) therefore indicate that self-efficacy and collective efficacy could be related to the different behavioural components of transformational leadership, which then lead to different work outcomes.

2.4. Related Constructs

Self-efficacy, as discussed in the previous section, is part of the Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura 1986) which reflects one’s judgment about one’s own perceived ability to accomplish a specific task (Bandura 1977). Though it is related, self-efficacy has different constructs to self-esteem, organizational-based self-esteem and collective self-esteem. The following sections discuss the definitions of these related constructs.

2.4.1 Self-esteem

Self esteem refers to an individual’s overall self-evaluation of his/her competencies (Rosenberg 1965). It refers to the ‘self-evaluation that individuals make with regard to themselves’ (Pierce et al 1989). For Korman (1970), self-esteem reflects the degree to which the individual ‘sees him- (her-) self as a competent, need-satisfying individual’. In other words, self-esteem reflects individuals’ personal judgements and beliefs about their own worthiness (Greenberg et al 1999). Since self-esteem is formed around work and organizational experiences, Korman (1970) suggests that individual’s self-esteem therefore plays a significant role in determining employee motivation, work-related attitudes and behaviours. Self-esteem has been found to be
associated with enhanced initiative, higher satisfaction and job performance at individual level (Judge and Bono 2001).

### 2.4.2 Organizational-based Self-Esteem

Organization-based self-esteem (OBSE) is defined as ‘the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of the organization’ (Pierce et al 1989). In other words, OBSE reflects employees’ evaluation of their personal adequacy and worthiness as organizational members so that individuals with high OBSE perceive themselves as important, meaningful, and worthwhile within their employing organization (Pierce et al 1989). Consistent with Korman’s (1976) view of self-esteem, Pierce et al (1989) suggest that individual with high OBSE has a sense of having satisfied their needs through their organizational roles.

Previous research has shown that OBSE is positively related to work-related behaviours. Pierce et al (1989) and Van Dyne and Pierce (2003) find a positive relationship between OBSE and job performance. Pierce et al (1993) and Gardner et al (2000) also find such a positive relationship in their longitudinal studies on OBSE.

### 2.4.3 Collective Self-esteem

Consistent with the social identity theory of Tajfel and Turner (1986), Crocker and Luhtanen (1990) suggest that an individual’s self-concept may be divided into two aspects: personal identity and social identity. Personal identity refers to beliefs about an individual’s personal worth. Social identity refers to the aspect of the individual’s self-concept that derives from memberships in a group and the value and emotional
significance attached to the membership (Tajfel 1981). Crocker and Luhanen (1990) introduce the concept of collective self-esteem, which is defined as the extent to which individuals associate their self-worth with their group membership. It refers to an evaluation of collective self of ‘us’ rather than of ‘me’ (Crocker and Luhtanen 1990).

Collective self-esteem has mainly been studied in intergroup relations research (Rubin and Hewstone 1998). It is found to be related to psychological adjustment, life satisfaction and general well-being (Blaine and Crocker 1995, Bettencourt and Dorr 1997 and Liang and Fassinger 2008).

2.4.4 Group Potency

Group potency is defined as ‘the collective belief of a group that it can be effective’ (Shea and Guzzo 1987, Guzzo 1986). It refers to a shared belief by group members about the group’s overall effectiveness at work. Group potency and collective efficacy are different in that potency refers to a more generalized belief regarding a group’s enduring ability to perform a wide range of tasks across different activities (Stajkovic et al 2009) while efficacy refers to a specific task.

Group potency and collective self-esteem are different in that group potency concerns the group’s performance or overall effectiveness whereas collective self-esteem does not is not associated directly with group performance effectiveness. Guzzo et al (1993) point out the difference in the two constructs via and illustration. While a group may have a weak belief that it can be effective (that is, have low potency), it may protect its collective self-esteem by devaluing other out-groups and inflating its
own significance. Thus the group may have high collective self-esteem even though group potency is low.

2.5. Target Similarity Framework

The importance of aligning the foci of both independent and dependent variables is central to the “target similarity” framework proposed by Lavelle et al (2007). The target similarity framework stems from the multi-focal approach in the commitment literature, which later on also emerges in the literature on organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. The multi-focal perspective of the three constructs of commitment, organizational justice and OCB suggests that employees meaningfully distinguish between targets. According to this framework, an antecedent is more likely to predict an outcome when the two constructs refer to the same target. Previous research adopted a multi-focal approach has provided evidence of a ‘target similarity effect’ – the relationship between constructs tends to be stronger when the constructs refer to the same or similar targets than when they refer to different targets.

The multi-focal perspective of commitment suggests that employees may maintain distinct levels of affective commitment towards different entities in the workplace, such as the organization, their supervisors or their work teams (Bishop and Scott 2000, Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow 2006, Linden et al 2003). For example, Becker and Kernan (2003) find that affective commitment to supervisors relates to in-role performance but effective commitment to organization does not. Effective commitment to organization, however, relates to loyalty to the organization but effective commitment to supervisor does not. Their results validate the multi-focal
perspective of commitments by demonstrating that employees distinguish among
effective and continuance commitments to supervisors and organizations. This
framework on organizational justice suggests that employees may hold meaningfully
distinct beliefs about the fairness towards decisions made by different decision-
making agents such as the organization, the supervisor or the work team (Blader and

The findings of Aryee et al (2002) suggest that employees can develop trust in
specific individuals, such as their supervisors, and distinctly, to generalized entities
such as the organization (Whitener 1997). Their results support this suggestion,
indicating that trust in supervisor and trust in organization are two distinctive
constructs that have different antecedents and outcomes. They find that trust in
organization mediates the relationship between organizational justice and
organization-related work outcomes and trust in supervisor mediates the relationship
between interactional justice and supervisor-related work outcomes. The multi-focal
perspective of organizational citizenship behaviour also suggests that it may be
directed towards specific individuals, such as supervisors or members of workgroups
within the organization.

Rupp and Cropanzano (2002) study the link between multi-focal justice and multi-
focal outcomes of performance and OCB with the mediation of multi-focal social
exchange relationships. Their results support the existence of target similarity effects,
namely that the relationships are highly correlated within the two foci and less highly
correlated across foci. The multi-focal model of organizational justice therefore
suggests that it is necessary to specify the source of justice, which can focus on the
organization, the supervisor, co-workers or customers.
2.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, the constructs that are central to this research are introduced. It also offers definitions of major constructs and theoretical discussion that underpins the model and hypothesis-development. In the next chapter the model and the hypotheses to be tested are presented in detail.
CHAPTER 3: MODEL AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

This chapter presents the model proposed in this thesis and provides theoretical justifications supporting each of the hypothesized relationships embodied in it, as indicated in Figure 1. These relationships are founded on the theories and research discussed in Chapter 2. The model overview highlights the role of each variable in the model. The hypotheses are summarized subsequently.

3.1 Model Overview

As the interdependencies detailed in Figure 1 indicate, at the individual level of analysis it is proposed that individual-focused TFL behaviours influence individual performance and career expectation through the mediation of personal self-efficacy. At the group level, group-focused TFL behaviours influence group performance and group organizational citizenship behaviour through the mediation of collective self-efficacy.

3.2 Hypothesis Development

3.2.1 Individual- and Group-focused Transformational Leadership Behaviours and Efficacy Belief

Underpinned by social cognitive theory, self-efficacy and collective efficacy are key cognitive mechanisms to motivate employees’ attitudes and behaviours (Bandura 1997). As detailed in Chapter 2, self-efficacy is defined as ‘individuals’ belief in their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance’ (Bandura 1994). Collective efficacy is defined as ‘a group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments
Self-efficacy and collective efficacy have different referents. That of self-efficacy is the individual while that of collective efficacy is the group.

Previous research has shown that transformational leadership, when treated as an individual or group level construct, is a predictor of efficacy belief at its respective level (Gong et al. 2009, Chen and Bliese 2002).

According to SCT, two main predictors of self-efficacy are social persuasion and vicarious experience. Social persuasion refers to direct persuasion by others that confirms the individual’s ability to accomplish tasks. Vicarious experience refers to observation and learning from social models. Individual-focused TFL behaviours focus on individuals’ needs, capabilities and affective states. Such behaviours stimulate followers to think and improve the quality of solutions they generate (Bass and Avolio 1990). Followers see themselves as capable of independent action and thereby develop a sense of self-worth (Pierce and Gardner 2004). The effects are seen in increases in followers’ abilities to conceptualize, comprehend, and analyze problems and in the improved quality of solutions that they generate (Bass and Avolio 1990). Individual-focused TFL behaviours may form a source of social persuasion because these behaviours strengthen the individual’s belief in his or her capabilities and promote a sense of personal self-efficacy.

Group-focused TFL leaders view group members as a whole and liaise with them as a group rather than as individuals. They aim at influencing the group by emphasizing common ground, shared values and ideology. Group-focused TFL behaviours are inspirational and focus on collective vision. Followers are likely to attend to and learn from such leaders (Bass and Avolio 1990). Such behaviours communicate confidence that followers can achieve ambitious goals and promote cooperation among team members (Antonakis and House 2002). Thus, group-focused TFL behaviours provide
followers with a source of vicarious experience on which individuals base their beliefs about self-efficacy. By focusing on group interests and the overall bond with the group, group focused TFL triggers followers’ self-categorization with the group (Kark and Shamir 2002), which is found to be associated with collective efficacy (Kark et al 2003, Wu et al 2010).

According to the target similarity framework, the relationship between constructs is stronger when the constructs refer to the same or similar targets. Applying the target similarity framework to this study, it is contended that the effects of TFL behaviours are specific to its target. Thus,

**Hypothesis 1.** Individual-focused TFL behaviours are positively related to personal self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2.** Group-focused TFL behaviours are positively related to collective self-efficacy.

### 3.2.2 The Mediating Role of Personal Efficacy at the Individual Level

In addition to individual performance, it is hypothesized that individual-focused TFL behaviours are related to career expectation. Career expectation is defined as perceptions of the likelihood to advance in the employing organization (Scandura and Schriesheim 1991). Research has found that mentoring is related to important career outcomes such as salary level, promotion rate and job satisfaction (Allen et al 2004, Scandura 1992, Whitely et al 1991), managerial mobility (Scandura and Williams 2004) and work role effectiveness (Kram 1985). Kram (1985). The method used has been the conduct of in-depth qualitative examinations of mentor–protégé dyads, identifying two types of mentor functions. The first is career-related support,
including coaching, protection and the presentation of challenging assignments that enhance proteges’ advancement in the organization. The second type of mentor function is psychosocial, addressing the interpersonal aspects of the relationship; in particular, “those aspects of a relationship that enhance an individual’s sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role” (Kram, 1985, p. 32).

Individual-focused transformational behaviours are consistent with the mentor’s career support function, which includes coaching and the assignment of challenging tasks that enhance individuals’ advancement in the organization (Allen 2003). Indeed, Scandura and Williams (2004) note that the concepts of transformational leadership and supervisory career mentoring are interrelated. They find a positive relationship between supervisory career mentoring and protégé career expectation. Individual-focused transformational behaviours focus on individuals’ needs, capabilities and affective state, allowing the assignment of tasks that fit followers’ capabilities and providing individual follower customized learning opportunities.

Bass (1985) notes that individualized consideration is strongly related to mentoring. This is because both involve high degrees of personalized attention. Transformational leaders who focus on individualized consideration may be more capable of delivering the coaching function (Hunt and Michael 1983). Vardi (1992) also conceptualizes this mentor role of individualized consideration as transforming because the linked followers develop into more competent and satisfied individuals. Based on the above, individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours may provide the career mentoring function, which is found to be positively related to followers’ career expectations (Scandura and Williams 2004).

It is therefore hypothesized that self-efficacy plays a mediating role in the relationship between individual-focused TFL behaviours and work outcomes of individual
performance and career expectation. The mechanism is that individual-focused TFL behaviours increase followers' self-efficacy, which is an important motivational construct that influences individuals' effort, coping and persistence (Bandura 1997, Gist and Mitchell 1992). When people experience higher levels of self-expression and personal control, there is an increased likelihood that individuals attribute positive events to themselves, thereby enhancing their self-efficacy (Pierce and Gardner 2004).

The self-confidence and competencies developed through raising self-efficacy are likely to reinforce better work performance and positive views towards career mobility. This notion is consistent with the self-oriented, identity approach to leadership effectiveness which states that our self-concept strongly informs our feelings, beliefs, attitudes, goals, and behaviours (Leary and Tangney 2003).

Leadership that is able to influence follower self-conception also influences follower attitudes and behaviour (Lord et al 1999, Shamir et al 1993). The notion is also consistent with Kark and Shamir's (2002) TFL framework that self-concept at the individual level is the mechanism underlying the individual effect of TFL. As implied by the target similarity framework, follower self-conception thus mediates the leadership behaviour and follower relationship specific to its target. The above discussion suggests the following further hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 3. Personal self-efficacy is positively related to individual performance and mediates the relationship of individual-focused TFL behaviours and individual performance.**

**Hypothesis 4. Personal self-efficacy is positively related to individual career expectation and mediates the relationship of individual-focused TFL behaviours and individual career expectation.**
3.2.3 The Mediating Role of Collective Efficacy at the Group Level

In addition to group performance, we hypothesize that group-focused TFL behaviours are related to group OCB. Organ (1988) defines OCB as ‘individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization’.

According to Podsakoff et al (1990), the most important effect of TFL is that such leaders induce followers to do more than they originally expected to do. They find that, in aggregate, TFL has an indirect effect on OCB. Group-focused TFL behaviours enhance a social work environment where group members have a shared vision. Members of the group who are intrinsically motivated to fulfill a collective vision without expecting immediate personal and tangible gains may be inclined to contribute toward achieving the shared workplace goals in ways that their roles do not prescribe (Wang et al 2005). Group-focused TFL behaviours therefore are more likely to lead followers to participate in behaviours that are outside the core of their duties.

The hypothesized mediating influence of collective-efficacy on the relationship between group-focused TFL behaviours and the work outcomes of group performance, as well as OCB, is on the basis that a strong belief in a group’s efficacy is found to have a positive effect on the group effectiveness (Gibson 1999, Gully et al 2002, Stajkovic et al 2009). As indicated in Chapter 2, Bandura (1997) suggests that collective efficacy influences what people choose to do as a team and how much effort they put into it. Having a strong belief in a group’s efficacy should therefore also increase motivation to expend extra effort to achieve the goals articulated by the group-focused leader. When group members believe they will be able to achieve their joint objectives if they persevere, they will be more united and more willing to go...
above and beyond prescribed roles to do whatever it takes to reach their goals (Organ et al 2006).

When team members connect their objectives and their collective tasks, they try to direct their efforts to help the collective effectiveness of the team by engaging in OCBs, such as by helping new co-workers and making suggestions to improve performance (Hu and Liden 2011). These OCBs, in turn, become a standard mode of team behaviour (Ehrhart and Naumann 2004). As implied by the target similarity framework, group-focused TFL behaviour therefore is likely to achieve its effects on group performance and OCB through the motivational implication of collective efficacy. Thus, the final hypotheses follow:

**Hypothesis 5.** Collective self-efficacy is positively related to group performance and mediates the relationship of group-focused TFL behaviours and group performance.

**Hypothesis 6.** Collective self-efficacy is positively related to group OCB and mediates the relationship of group-focused TFL behaviours and group OCB.

### 3.3 Conclusion

In this section, the hypotheses and their positions within the research are discussed. Theoretical arguments and empirical evidence supporting each of the hypotheses is detailed, at both the individual and group levels in the model. The model builds on the target similarity framework and draws on the notion of social cognitive theory. The theoretical argument is consistent with the self-concept theory of leadership. The model includes two levels of analysis. The hypotheses are tested in the main study to confirm whether the relationships are supported, and these results are reported in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4: STUDY 1

FOCUS GROUP TO VALIDATE THE MEASURING SCALE OF
INDIVIDUAL-FOCUSED AND GROUP-FOCUSED TRANSFORMATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

This chapter describes Study 1, which is a focus group analysis designed to validate the distinction between individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire MLQ form 5X (Bass and Avolio 1995). This chapter comprises four sections. The first section explains the purpose of the study. Details of data collection and procedures are presented in the second section. The third section presents the results of this study, follow by Section four which includes the discussion of results and finally the conclusion of this Chapter.

4.1 Objectives of Study

Considering the absence of prior research confirming the distinction between individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours, as represented in the MLQ form 5X (Bass and Avolio 1995), the first step is to test this in a focus group study. The idea is to provide support for the distinction of group-focused and individual-focused TFL behaviours. This is required by the main study, which is to test the hypothesized relationships between the individual level variables including individual-focused TFL behaviours, personal self-efficacy, individual performance and individual career expectation, and group level variables including group-focused TFL behaviours, collective self-efficacy, group OCB and group performance.
4.2 Method

4.2.1 Item Generation

Following Wu et al (2010), the wording of the twelve items in the three subscales of behavioural idealized influence, attributive idealized influence and inspirational motivation of MLQ5x (Bass and Avolio 1995) is revised to represent a work group referent to match the conceptualization of group-focused TFL behaviours. For example: “Our group leader makes clear the importance of having a strong sense of purpose in working with the group as a whole” and “Our group leader emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission when working in the group as a whole’. For individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation the original MLQ wording of the eight items is retained, with individual as referent to match the conceptualization of individual-focused TFL behaviours. Examples of items are ‘My group leader suggests to me new ways of looking at how to complete assignments’ and ‘My group leader challenges me to re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate’.

4.2.2 Procedure

The data were collected from postgraduate students enrolled in Business coursework programs - 35 from Australia and 42 from Beijing China. Participants were asked to categorize the 20-items into individual-focused or group-focused based on their definitions.

Individual-focused leadership behaviours refer to leaders who vary their behaviour based on a follower’s individual differences. These behaviours aim at influencing individual employees by focusing on individuals’ needs, capabilities and affective...
states. These leaders are highly aware of each person's unique skills, thereby allowing leaders to assign tasks that fit followers' capabilities and to provide customized learning opportunities. Examples of individual-focused leadership behaviours include:

- customized coaching of each individual;
- encouragement of followers to seek innovative and creative solutions to problems;
- appeals to followers' intellect so they question their assumptions.

Group-focused leadership behaviours refer to leaders viewing group members as a whole and liaising with them as a group rather than as individuals. These behaviours aim at influencing the group by emphasizing common ground, shared values and ideology. Leaders focus on an overall bond with the group rather than with individual followers and encourage commitment to the group by its members. Examples of group-focused leadership behaviours include:

- delivering speeches to the group to reflect leaders' values, beliefs and ideology;
- using non-verbal cues to propose and collectively articulate attractive and aspiring visions to groups of followers;
- being a role model for followers;
- displaying commitment to the group by exhibiting and encouraging solidarity and fairness across its members.

Questionnaires distributed to the Chinese sample were written in Chinese. To assure equivalence of the Chinese and the English versions of the items, the standard translation and back-translation procedure of Brislin (1980) was used.
4.3 Results

The kappa coefficient was used to measure inter-rater agreement in sorting the 20 items into the individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours categories. The kappa value for the Chinese and the Australian sample was 0.70 and 0.73 respectively. The results represent substantial agreement in both the Eastern and Western cultural samples that all 12 items measuring behavioural idealized influence, attributive idealized influence and inspirational motivation should be classified as group-focused TFL behaviours and that the eight items measuring inspirational motivation and idealized attributes should be classified as individual-focused TFL behaviours.

4.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to confirm the distinction between individual- and group-focused TFL behaviours, as represented in the MLQ form 5X (Bass and Avolio 1995). The findings of this study provide evidence that transformational leadership behaviours can be distinguished as group-focused and individual-focused. The six associated hypotheses were then tested and the analysis and results are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5: STUDY 2 (MAIN STUDY)

DUAL-LEVEL EFFECTS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

THE MEDIATING ROLE OF EFFICACY BELIEF

This chapter describes Study 2, which is the main study of the thesis. Study 2 was designed to test, firstly, the hypothesized relationships between the individual level variables, reflecting individual-focused TFL behaviours, including personal self-efficacy, individual performance and individual career expectation. Secondly, it tests the hypothesized relationships amongst the group level study variables, reflecting group-focused TFL behaviours, and including collective self-efficacy, group OCB and group performance. Section one is an outline of the purpose of the study. The details associated with sampling and data collection procedures are presented in Section two. Data analysis issues pertaining to the level of analysis are presented in Section three. In Section four, the results are reported regarding the measurement models, data aggregations and hypothesis testing. Finally the discussion of the results and the conclusion are outlined in Sections four and five.

5.1 Objectives of Study

Given that the results of the pilot study provide support for the distinction between group-focused and individual-focused TFL behaviours, it is appropriate that the study examine the relationships between the independent variables, two mediating variables, and the outcomes at both the individual and group levels. Hypotheses 1 and 2 concern the direct effects and hypotheses 2 to 6 concern the mediating effects. These hypotheses are tested as described here.
5.2 Method

5.2.1 Sample

Data was obtained from the employees of a five-star business hotel in a major city in the People’s Republic of China. The survey was carried out with the approval and assistance of the Hotel’s management. The sample comprised 297 subordinates and 100 supervisors, representing 100 work teams. The survey included departments in divisions responsible for Rooms, the Concierge, Sales and Marketing, Accounting, Security and Human Resources, along with the Food and Beverage Department. The diverse task contexts of this sample enhance the generalizability of the findings. The average team member (subordinate) age was 37 years and 49% were female. The average organization tenure of team members was 13.9 years, and they had worked with their leader for 6.8 years on average. The average leader age was 43 years and 59% were female. The average organization tenure of leaders was 17.3 years.

5.2.2 Procedure

Two sets of questionnaires were used: one for subordinates and one for their immediate supervisors. The separate questionnaires were coded to facilitate the matching of supervisors and subordinates. No personal or sensitive information was sought or obtained. Time was assigned by the organization to supervisors and subordinates separately for filling out the questionnaires, which ensured a very high return rate. To ensure confidentiality, the respondents were instructed to seal the completed questionnaires in the envelopes and return them directly to the researchers onsite. Matching questionnaires from 100 dyads with 297 subordinates and 100 supervisors were received, representing 100 percent of the respondents surveyed.
Upon subsequent analysis, three of these were eliminated due to incompleteness or inconsistency of responses, leaving a final sample of 97 dyads with 97 supervisors and 277 employees.

5.2.3 Measures

The data collected from subordinates excludes the ratings of employee performance, group performance and group OCB. All questionnaires were in Chinese. The standard translation and back-translation procedure of Brislin (1980) was performed to ensure equivalence of the Chinese and the English versions. Items were first translated into Chinese from English and then back translated into Chinese to ensure the transmission of meaning. The measures used are as follows.

*Group-focused TFL Behaviours.* For these the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire MLQ5x (Bass and Avolio 1995) is used, with subscales of behavioural idealized influence, attributive idealized influence and inspirational motivation, which were validated in the pilot study, included to measure group-focused TFL behaviours. The wording of the items in these three subscales is revised to represent a work group referent to match the conceptualization of group-focused TFL. Examples are: 'Our group leader makes clear the importance of having a strong sense of purpose in working with the group as a whole' and 'Our group leader emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission when working in the group as a whole'. Responses are on a scale ranging from 0 ('not at all') to 7 ('frequently, if not always'). A composite group-focused TFL score is then created by averaging the scores of the subordinates in the same team. For this measure, Cronbach’s alpha is 0.92.
**Individual-focused TFL Behaviours.** The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire MLQ5x (Bass and Avolio 1995) is used; and in particular the subscales of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation, which were validated in the pilot study. These are employed in the measurement of individual-focused TFL behaviour. Examples of this measure are: ‘My group leader spends time with me teaching and coaching’ and ‘My group leader considers me as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others’. Responses were obtained on a scale ranging from 0 (‘not at all’) to 7 (‘frequently, if not always’). For this measure, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.86.

**Collective Self-efficacy.** Collective self-efficacy is assessed using the seven-item Collective Self-efficacy Scale of Riggs and Knight (1994). Individuals were asked to rate on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = (‘strongly disagree’) to 7 = (‘strongly agree’) their own perceptions of the team’s efficacy. Examples are: ‘My work team has above average ability’ and ‘Members of my work team have excellent job skills’. A composite collective self-efficacy score is then created by averaging the scores of the subordinates in the same team. Cronbach’s alpha for collective self-efficacy was 0.80.

**Personal Self-efficacy.** Personal self-efficacy is also assessed using the 10-item Personal Self-efficacy Scale of Riggs and Knight (1994). Respondents were offered a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = (‘strongly disagree’) to 7 = (‘strongly agree’). Examples are: ‘I have confidence in my ability to do my job’ and ‘I am very proud of my job skills and abilities’. Cronbach’s alpha for personal self-efficacy was 0.86.

**Group Performance.** Each supervisor was asked to rate the performance of their work group. Group performance is derived from an individual competence measure
(Heilman et al 1992) that is modified based on previous studies (Lam et al 2004, Man and Lam 2003) to measure performance at the team level. The three items used in this study are: ‘This team gets its work done very effectively’, ‘This team is very competent’ and ‘This team has performed its job well’. Each item is measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’, 7 = ‘strongly agree’). For this measure, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.91.

*Group Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.* Supervisors rated the performance of the work groups’ OCB according to a Group OCB scale developed by Euwema et al (2007). An example is: “People in my team are always willing to provide help in getting the work done”. Each item is measured on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’, 7 = ‘strongly agree’). Cronbach’s alpha for this measure was 0.90.

*Individual Performance.* Supervisors rated the performance of subordinates using a four-item scale developed by Farh and Cheng (1999). This scale had previously been used in a Chinese context (Chen et al 2002, Chen and Aryee 2007). Sample items are: ‘The performance of this subordinate always meets his/her supervisor’s requirements’ and ‘This subordinate makes an important contribution to the overall performance of our work team’. Each item was measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = (‘strongly disagree’) to 7 = (‘strongly agree’). Cronbach’s alpha for Individual Performance was 0.82.

*Career Expectation.* Career expectation was assessed using a scale by Scandura and Schriesheim (1991). An example is: ‘I expect to be promoted in my organization’. Respondents were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = (‘strongly disagree’) to 7 = (‘strongly agree’). For this measure, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.74.
5.3 Level of Analysis

Previous research has tended to treat transformational leadership as an overarching construct and it has failed to address the level of analysis issue (Wang and Howell 2010). Here, the level of analysis refers to the unit to which the data are assigned for hypothesis testing and analysis (Rousseau 1985). The level of theory should dictate the level at which a construct is measured and analysed (Gully et al 2002). In order to address the level-of-analysis issue, individual-focused TFL behaviours are here conceptualised as an individual-level construct and the level of analysis is individual. Group-focused TFL behaviours are conceptualized as a collective construct and so the level of analysis is the team. Individual-focused TFL behaviours, personal self-efficacy, individual performance and career expectation are measured at individual level. Group-focused TFL behaviours, collective self-efficacy, group performance and group OCB are treated as group-level variables. Group-focused TFL behaviours and collective self-efficacy are measured at the individual-level and are then aggregated to the group level. Group performance and group OCB are rated by team supervisors at the group level.

Before examining the hypothesis tests the aggregation of group-focused TFL behaviours and collective efficacy measures require justification. Intra-class correlation (ICCs) and intra-class inter-rater agreement ($r_{wg}$) tests are used to check the statistical validity of the aggregation. The values for ICC(1) and ICC(2) are 0.17 and 0.38, respectively, for group-focused TFL behaviours, and 0.17 and 0.37 for collective efficacy. The mean values of $r_{wg}$ for group-focused TFL behaviours and collective efficacy are 0.89 and .78, respectively. The relatively low ICC(2) values suggest that it may be difficult to detect emergent relationships using group means (Bliese 2000). The low ICC(2) value should not prevent aggregation, however, if
aggregation is justified by theory and supported by both high $r_{wg}$ values and significant between-groups variance (Chen and Bliese 2002, Kozlowski and Hattrup 1992). The analysis therefore follows Liao and Chuang (2007) and proceeds with the aggregation, though it is acknowledged that the relationship between the aggregated measures with low ICC(2) and the other study variables might be underestimated.

5.4 Results

Complete data were obtained from 97 supervisors (97% response rate) and 278 subordinates (94% response rate). Each supervisor has 2 to 3 subordinates, averaging 2.87. The average age of team members (subordinate) is 37 years and 49% were female. The average organizational tenure of team members was 13.9 years, and they had worked with their leaders for 6.8 years on average. The average leader age was 43 years and 59% were female. The average organizational tenure of leaders was 17.3 years.

5.4.1 Hypothesis Testing

Reliability measures and correlations for all study variables are provided in Table 1. Structural equation modelling (SEM) with latent constructs is used to test the six hypotheses, via LISREL 8.80. The analysis draws on the principles set forth by Baron and Kenny (1986) for testing mediation via applied regression analysis. Tables 2 and 3 summarise the regression results.

As shown in Table 2, individual-focused TFL behaviours is positively related to personal self-efficacy, $\beta = 0.14$, $p < 0.05$ (see Step1). Thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported. The results also showed that individual-focused TFL behaviours is related to
individual performance, $\beta = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$; and career expectation, $\beta = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$ (see Step 2). As per steps 3 and 4 in Table 2, personal self-efficacy is significantly related to individual performance, $\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$; and career expectation, $\beta = 0.17$, $p < 0.01$ when individual-focused TFL behaviours is controlled for. The results also reveal that the previously significant relationships between individual-focused TFL behaviours and work outcomes continue to be significant. The third condition for mediation is only partially supported. Thus, Hypotheses 3 and 4 receive only partial support.

As shown in Table 3, group-focused TFL behaviours is positively related to collective efficacy, $\beta = .24$, $p < .01$ (see Step1). Hypothesis 2 is therefore supported. The results also showed that group-focused TFL behaviours is related to group performance, $\beta = .36$, $p < .01$; and group OCB, $\beta = .27$, $p < .01$ (see Step 2). As per steps 3 and 4 in Table 3, collective self-efficacy is significantly related to group performance, $\beta = .27$, $p < .01$; and group OCB, $\beta = .25$, $p < .01$, when group-focused TFL behaviours is controlled for (see Steps 3 and 4). The results also reveal that the previously significant relationships between group-focused TFL behaviours and work outcomes continue to be significant. The third condition for mediation was only partially supported, however. Specifically, Hypotheses 5 and 6 receive only partial support.

5.5 Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to examine the team level and individual processes through which transformational leadership affects both team and individual outcomes. The behavioural links between transformational leadership, the predictors of efficacy
beliefs and work outcomes at the individual and group levels are identified. Based on social cognitive theory, self-concept theory and the target similarity framework, a dual-level transformational leadership model with individual- and group-level mediators is developed and the mediating process at both levels is tested. The findings of this study support the direct relationships between individual TFL behaviours and personal efficacy and between group TFL behaviours and collective efficacy. Furthermore, the findings partially support the mediation effects of efficacy beliefs at both the individual and group levels.

In the next chapter, implications for theory and management practices derived from the findings are presented. Limitations and future research directions related to this thesis will also be discussed.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

This chapter provides a summary of the results from the two empirical studies and their implications. It also highlights the implications for theory and research, as well as the limitations of this research. The limitations, together with future research directions, are outlined in Section four.

6.1 Summary of Results

The results of the study support the key hypotheses. Specifically, at the individual level, personal self-efficacy partially mediates the links between individual-focused transformational leadership behaviours and individual performance, as well as individual career expectation. At the same time, collective efficacy, at the group level, partially mediates group-focused transformational leadership behaviours and group performance, as well as group organizational citizenship behaviours. Moreover, the results provide several extensions to research on transformational leadership and multilevel processes, with important implications for managerial practices.

6.2 Implications for Theory and Practice

The results suggest three theoretical implications. First, the pilot study indicates that behavioural components of TFL can be distinguished as between individual- and group-focused. It suggests that the use of TFL as a general construct at individual and group levels should be revisited. Second, the examination of the mediation process through which the effects of individual- and group-focused TFL behaviours are manifested extends Wang and Howell’s (2010) results. Specifically, significant support is found for the hypothesis that the effects of individual- and group-focused
TFL behaviours on work outcomes are indirect and partially mediated by personal and collective efficacy beliefs, respectively. Third, the current study extends research on TFL by examining its behavioural components from a multifocal perspective (Settoon et al 1996). It answers the call for the need to specify foci of psychological processes by specifying the sources among antecedents, mediators and outcomes (Lavelle et al 2007).

This study also has several practical implications. First, the direct effects of dual-level TFL indicate that managers should use somewhat different strategies to lead individual team members and teams as a whole (Wang and Howell 2010). To motivate individual team members in support of individual performance and career expectation, leaders should focus on their employees' needs, capabilities and affective states. To lead teams as a whole in order to enhance team performance and team OCB, team leaders should focus on an overall bond within the group and communicate a compelling vision to team members. Second, the finding that efficacy beliefs at both individual and group levels play an important mediating role suggests that organizations should sensitize supervisors to the effects of their leadership practices on efficacy beliefs of subordinates and groups. Accordingly, strategies that enhance subordinate and team efficacy beliefs should be incorporated into leadership training programs.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research Directions

This work adds to a growing body of research on the behavioural components of TFL. Specifically, the study confirms that it is valid to distinguish between TFL that is either group-focused or individual-focused. It sheds some light on the mechanisms
via which the effects of individual- and group-focused behavioural components of TFL are manifested. It also contributes to multi-focal research by identifying and separating intended beneficiaries of TFL and measuring the effects specific to the target. This research, however, has several limitations. These include the use of a cross-section research design, with its associated weak generalizability, issues associated with possible biases when outcomes are self-reported and a low ICC(2) that should be addressed in future research.

First, the use of a cross-sectional design limits exploration of the dynamic nature of the relationships between individual-focused and group-focused TFL behaviours and their work outcomes. Cross-sectional designs only show general relationships amongst the variables and do not allow them to determine the direction of causality. This could be important as between individual-focused TFL behaviours, personal self-efficacy, individual performance and career expectation at the individual level, and group-focused TFL behaviours, collective self-efficacy, group OCB and group performance at the group level. Thus, cause-effect relationships should not be inferred from the research findings.

Second, the main survey was conducted in a five-star hotel in Guangzhou, People’s Republic of China. Though different departments in the hotel participated in the survey, the single organizational context may affect the generalizability of the findings. Future studies should ideally include teams from multiple organizations to understand more fully the relationships between dual-level focused TFL behaviours and their effects on work outcomes. Third, the outcome variable of Career Expectation is based on employees’ self-reports. Employees might be suspicious of the anonymity commitment and so could respond to the questionnaire items in such a manner as to enhance their standing.
Finally, the values for ICC(2) are 0.38 and 0.37, respectively, for group-focused TFL behaviours, and collective efficacy. The relatively low ICC(2) values suggest that it may be difficult to detect emergent relationships using group means (Bliese 2000). The precedent set by Liao and Chuang (2007) is followed, however, and the aggregation is carried out while acknowledging that the relationship between the aggregated measures with low ICC(2) and the other study variables might be underestimated.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a summary of results and has highlighted the research implications for theory and management practice. It has also included a discussion of the limitations of the studies represented in the thesis, including the use of cross-section research design and the associated lack of generalizability, the issues associated with self-reported outcome variables and the low ICC(2). The next chapter offers final conclusions.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

This chapter presents a brief recap of the main findings of this research and concludes the thesis.

7.1 Summary of Objectives and Main Findings

The two studies reported in the thesis shed light on the dual level effects of transformational leadership. The original objectives were: first, to examine which behavioural components of transformational leadership exert influence on groups and individuals and which on individuals, and second, to discover the underlying mechanisms that enable transformational leaders to be able to affect individual and collective behaviours.

The results of the studies support the formulated hypotheses. Specifically at the individual level, personal self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between individual-focused TFL behaviours and individual performance, as well as individual career expectation. At the same time, collective efficacy, at the group level, partially mediates group-focused TFL behaviours and group performance, as well as group organizational citizenship behaviours.

7.2 Thesis Conclusion

Social cognitive theory provides overarching principles based on which a dual-level transformational leadership model is developed. Efficacy at the individual- and the group-levels are used as mediators and their roles in the mediating process are tested at both individual and group levels. By contrasting different levels conceptually and testing them relative to one another in the same study, the objective has been to draw
clearer conclusions about associations and the levels at which they operate, as suggested by Yammarino et al (1998). To do this, both a pilot study and a major survey of workers and leaders in a major hotel in China’s great Southern city of Guangzhou are carried out. The results support the conjectures that efficacy mediation is important at both group and individual levels, bearing out Yammarino’s suggestion. The results suggest several extensions to research on transformational leadership and multilevel processes, with important implications for managerial practices.
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FIGURES

Figure 1

Hypothesized Model of the Processes Linking Individual- and Group-Focused Transformational Leadership Behaviours to Work Outcomes
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### Figure 2

**Comparison of Transformational-Charismatic Leadership Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealised influence</td>
<td>Vision and articulation</td>
<td>Ideological emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>Personal risk</td>
<td>Displaying exemplary behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>Does not maintain status quo</td>
<td>Emphasizing collective identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized consideration</td>
<td>Sensitivity to member needs</td>
<td>Supportive behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: This figure was extracted from van Knippenberg (2013).
The Person I am Rating...

Idealised Influence (Attributed)
1. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her
2. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group
3. Acts in ways that builds my respect
4. Displays a sense of power and confidence

Idealised Influence (Behaviour)
1. Talks about their most important values and beliefs
2. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
3. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions
4. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission

Inspirational Motivation
1. Talks optimistically about the future
2. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
3. Articulates a compelling vision of the future
4. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved

Intellectual Stimulation
1. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate
2. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems
3. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles
4. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments

Individualized Consideration
1. Spends time teaching and coaching
2. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group
3. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others
4. Helps me to develop my strengths
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Group Focused TFL behaviours</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collective Self Efficacy</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Performance</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Organizational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual focused TFL behaviours</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal Self Efficacy</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Career Expectation</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individual Performance</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 97 supervisors; N = 278 subordinates. Internal consistency reliabilities appear in parentheses diagonal. TFL = transformational leadership

*p < .05.

**p < .01
Table 2:
Mediation of the Relationship of Individual-focused Transformational Leadership Behaviours with Career Expectation and Individual Performance by Personal Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Career Expectation</th>
<th>Individual Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-focused TFL behaviour</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-focused TFL behaviour</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps 3 and 4:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-focused TFL behaviour</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a N = 97 supervisors; N = 278 subordinates with list-wise deletion. Standardized regression coefficients are shown. The asterisks indicate significance at the five and one per cent levels: * p < .05, ** p < .01.
Table 3:

Mediation of the Relationship of Group-focused Transformational Leadership Behaviours with Group OCB and Group Performance by Collective Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collective Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Group OCB</th>
<th>Group Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-focused TFL behaviour</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-focused TFL behaviour</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps 3 and 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-focused TFL behaviour</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a N = 97 supervisors; N = 278 subordinates with list-wise deletion. Standardized regression coefficients are shown. The asterisks indicate significance at the five and one per cent levels: * p < .05, ** p < .01.
### APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 1:</th>
<th>Fully supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual-focused TFL behaviours are positively related to personal self-efficacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 2:</th>
<th>Fully supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group-focused TFL behaviours are positively related to collective self-efficacy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 3:</th>
<th>Partially supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-efficacy is positively related to individual performance and mediates the relationship of individual-focused TFL behaviours and individual performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 4:</th>
<th>Partially supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-efficacy is positively related to individual career expectation and mediates the relationship of individual-focused TFL behaviours and individual career expectation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 5:</th>
<th>Partially supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective self-efficacy is positively related to group performance and mediates the relationship of group-focused TFL behaviours and group performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 6:</th>
<th>Partially supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective self-efficacy is positively related to group OCB and mediates the relationship of group-focused TFL behaviours and group OCB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Individual and Group Focused Leadership Behaviours
A Very Short Survey

Purpose:
This short survey is part of a larger research project to investigate leadership behaviours that influence individuals and groups, and their relationships with employees’ work outcomes. Your assistance is much appreciated, since it will assist with the project by shedding light on effective leadership behaviours in organizations. Thank you.

Background Information

**Individual-focused leadership behaviours** suggest that leaders vary their behaviour based on follower’s individual differences. These behaviours aim at influencing individual employees by focusing on individuals’ needs, capabilities and affective states. These leaders are highly aware of each person’s unique skills, thereby allowing leaders to assign tasks that fit followers’ capabilities and to provide customized learning opportunities. Examples of individual-focused leadership behaviours include:

- customized coaching to each individual;
- gets followers to seek innovative and creative solutions to problems;
- appealing to followers’ intellect so they question their assumptions.

**Group-focused leadership behaviours** suggest that leaders view group members as a whole and liaise with them as a group rather than as individuals. These behaviours aim at influencing the group by emphasizing common ground, shared values and ideology. Leaders focus on an overall bond with the group rather than with individual followers and encourage commitment to the group by its members. Examples of group-focused leadership behaviours include:

- delivering speeches to the group to reflect leaders’ values, beliefs and ideology;
- using non-verbal cues to propose and collectively articulate attractive and aspiring visions to groups of followers;
- being a role model for followers;
- displaying commitment to the group by exhibiting and encouraging solidarity and fairness across its members.

**Based on the above definitions**, please indicate whether you perceive the following statements to be individual-focused or group-focused.

**There are no right or wrong answers. It all depends on your perception.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group Focused</th>
<th>Individual Focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My group leader challenges me to re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our group leader talks about the most important values and beliefs when working in a group as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My group leader gets me to seek differing perspectives when solving problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our group leader talks to us optimistically about the future of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our group leader instils pride in us for being associated with him/her in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Our group leader talks to us enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Our group leader specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose in working with the group as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My group leader spends time with me teaching and coaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Our group leader goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My group leader treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Our group leader acts in ways that build respect in our group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Our group leader considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions when working in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Our group leader displays to our group a sense of power and confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Our group leader articulates to our group a compelling vision of the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My group leader considers me as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My group leader gets me to look at problems from many different angles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My group leader helps me to develop my strength.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My group leader suggests to me new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Our group leader emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission when working in the group as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Our group leader expresses confidence that our group goals will be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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调查问卷

您好！本学院正在进行一项学术研究，这份简单的问卷是这项学术研究的其中一部份，旨在探讨大家对个人和集体为主的领导行为的看法。这问卷属纯学术研究，您的配合将帮助我们更好的完成研究计划，恳请您拨冗协助。

请仔细阅读说明后再开始作答，题目没有所谓“对”或“错”的答案。您不必参考别人的意见，只要按照您的判断填答即可。

非常感谢您的合作！

澳大利亚国立大学
管理-营销及国际商务学院
问卷说明

以下是个人作为主导领导行为和团体作为主导领导行为的定义：

个人作为主导领导行为
个人作为的领导会考虑下属的不同需要，能力和情绪。这类型的领导会根据每个下属的独特能力去分配工作，和提供适合的学习机会。
以下是一些个人作为主导领导行为的例子：
- 领导根据下属的需要而作出传授和指导；
- 领导鼓励下属提出创新的方法去解决问题；
- 领导鼓励下属对问题的背后原因反复思考。

团体作为主导领导行为
团体作为的领导会把下属当作是团体中的一员，而不是独立的个体。这类型的领导强调各成员之间的联系，集体价值观和信念，并鼓励成员对团体的承诺。以下是一些团体作为主导领导行为的例子：
- 领导对团体的讲话反映出领导的价值观和信念；
- 领导对团体传递令人激动人心的愿景；
- 领导作为团体的榜样；
- 领导表现出对团体的承诺，并对团体各员公平公正。

请根据以上的定义，评断以下各个叙述为个人或团体作为的领导行为，并打一个 √。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>序号</th>
<th>个人为主的领导行为</th>
<th>团体为主的领导行为</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>我的主管激励我反复思考问题背后的原因，看其是否妥当。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>我们的主管谈论他/她对团队最重视的价值观和信念。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>我的主管激励我从不同角度去解决困难。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>我们的主管乐观地谈论团队的未来。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>我们的主管向团队灌输一种与他/她共事的光荣感。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>我们的主管热衷于谈论团队所要完成的工作。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>我们的主管强调我们要有明确的团体目标。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>我的主管花时间对我传授与指导。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>我们的主管注重团体利益大于个人利益。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>我的主管把我当作是独立的个体，而不只是把我当作是团体中的一员。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>我们的主管行为表现令工作团队各成员尊敬。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>我们的主管在团队决策上会考虑到道德与伦理的后果。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>我们的主管在工作团队中表现出权力感和自信感。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>我们的主管对工作团队传递激动队员的愿景。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>我的主管考虑到我有不同于他人的需求、能力与抱负。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>我的主管让我从多个不同的角度来观察问题。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>我的主管帮助我发展我的长处。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>我的主管就如何完成工作给我提供新的建议。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>我们的主管对工作团队强调有集体使命感的重要性。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. 我们的主管对达成团队目标表现出自信。
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The Supervisor Questionnaire for Study 2 (Main Study)
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Notes:

1. Two sets of questionnaires were used: one for subordinates and one for their immediate supervisors.

2. In the Supervisor Questionnaire, Section 1 is a individual performance scale, Section 2 consists of group organization citizenship behaviour scale (item 1 – 5) and team performance scale (item 6 – 8).
SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Sir/Madam

The purpose of the study is to identify the relationship between management leadership styles, workers’ motivation and work outcomes. It will take around 10 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

Your participation is voluntary. All information will be confidential. Your responses will be coded and you will not be personally identified. It is not necessary to put your name on the survey.

Your assistance in this study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and your participation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments about this study.

Yours sincerely

Ka Yee LAU
MPhil candidate
College of Business and Economics
Australian National University
Before you begin, please choose three of your subordinates (subordinate A, subordinate B and subordinate C) and complete their details below. If you have less than three subordinates, please complete the following details of all the subordinates. For confidentiality, please do not write down their names.

Subordinate A code:__________ Gender: M/F Age:_____ Job title/duties:_______
Subordinate B code:__________ Gender: M/F Age:_____ Job title/duties:_______
Subordinate C code:__________ Gender: M/F Age:_____ Job title/duties:_______

**SECTION ONE**

Please indicate the extent you agree with the following statements describing your subordinate. Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate 1</th>
<th>Subordinate 2</th>
<th>Subordinate 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This subordinate makes an important contribution to the overall performance of our work unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This subordinate is one of the excellent employees in our work unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This subordinate always completes job assignments on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The performance of this subordinate always meets my requirements/expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO
Please indicate the extent you agree with the following statements describing your work team. Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The people in my work team are always willing to provide help in getting the work done
2. The people in my work team are willing to put in extra time on the job
3. The people in my work team will usually go out of their way to make the work group successful
4. The people in my work team are willing to make sacrifices to get the job done
5. The people in my work team will gladly take on other’s responsibilities in an emergency
6. This team gets its work done very effectively
7. This team performs very competently
8. This team performs very well

SECTION THREE
Please complete the following information about yourself.

1. Gender:  □ Male  □ Female
2. Year of birth: __________
3. Number of years of formal education: _______ years
   (e.g. primary school = 6 years; elementary school = 9 years; ...)
4. Your position:  □ general staff  □ junior manager  □ middle manager  □ senior manager
5. How long have you worked for this company: _______ years _______ months
6. Your job title: __________________
7. Your department: __________________
8. Your mother language:  □ cantonese  □ shanghaiese  □ mandarin  □ other ______
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尊敬的先生/女士：

感谢您的支持！本次学术研究的目的在于探讨管理者领导风格、员工工作动机和工作绩效之间的关系。您的配合将帮助我们更好的完成研究计划。

问卷每部份前面都有说明，请仔细阅读说明后再开始作答，题目没有所谓“对”或“错”的答案。您只要按照实际情形填答即可。答完后，请将问卷封入随附的信封中，交回人力资源部。

本次研究属纯学术研究，您所提供的资料将被保密，任何人（包括人力资源部、您的上司、下属和同事）都不会看到您所填的答案，问卷收集后您的答案将立刻被编码并交由电脑进行整体分析，绝对不会披露任何一位填报人身份，请您放心坦诚填答。

贵公司的许多主管也正在帮助填写这份问卷，恳请您拨冗协助。

非常感谢您的合作！
主管编号：

主管问卷填写说明

首先，请在您的直接下属中选出三位（下属甲，下属乙和下属丙），其中一位下属的表现较好，一位表现中等，一位表现较差。并把他们的资料填在下面。假如您的直接下属少于三位，请把所有的下属都填上。为了保密，不必写下该直接下属的真实名字。但在填答问卷的时候，请记住谁是下属甲，下属乙和下属丙，不能混乱。

下属甲
问卷编号：______： □男 □女 职务：______

下属乙
问卷编号：______： □男 □女 职务：______

下属丙
问卷编号：______： □男 □女 职务：______

（一）请依据以下每个句子来评价您下属的行为表现。请针对每位下属，在相应的栏目中填上一个数字，1 代表非常不同意，7 代表非常同意。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>下属甲</th>
<th>下属乙</th>
<th>下属丙</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

非常不同意 相当不同意 有点不同意 不能决定 有点同意 相当同意 非常同意
（二）下列语句都是形容您三位下属所属团队/部门的行为。请分别就下列每个语句，逐项回答您对每一叙述之同意程度。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非</th>
<th>相</th>
<th>有</th>
<th>不</th>
<th>有</th>
<th>相</th>
<th>非</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>常</td>
<td>当</td>
<td>能</td>
<td>点</td>
<td>当</td>
<td>常</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>不</td>
<td>不</td>
<td>决</td>
<td>同</td>
<td>同</td>
<td>同</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>同</td>
<td>同</td>
<td>定</td>
<td>意</td>
<td>意</td>
<td>意</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 此团队/部门很能干。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 此团队/部门工作很有效率。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 此团队/部门工作做的很好。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 此团队/部门经常愿意提供帮助，以完成任务。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 此团队/部门愿意加班工作。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 此团队/部门会创新工作方式，确保团队/部门工作成功。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 此团队/部门愿意做出牺牲以完成工作。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 有需要时，此团队/部门乐意承担额外责任。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

最后，请您再填一些个人背景资料，以作整体分析之用。

1. 您的性别： □ 男性 □ 女性
2. 您的年龄： _______
3. 您受过正式教育的年数： ______ 年
   （例如：小学毕业= 6 年；初中毕业= 9 年；高中= 12 年；大学毕业= 16 年）
4. 您的职位： □ 基层主管 □ 中层主管 □ 高层主管
5. 您在现职公司多久： ______ 年 ______ 月
6. 您的职务： ___________________
7. 您任职的部门： ___________________
8. 您的母语： □ 普通话 □ 广东话 □ 其他（请注明） _______

本问卷至此己全部结束，谢谢您的合作！
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Note: In the Subordinate Questionnaire, Section 1 is group-focused and individual-focused TFL scales, Section 2 consists of a collective self-efficacy scale (item 1 – 7), a personal self-efficacy scale (item 8 – 17) and a career expectation scale (items 18 – 21).
Dear Sir/Madam

The purpose of the study is to identify the relationship between management leadership styles, workers’ motivation and work outcomes. It will take around 30 minutes to complete this questionnaire.

Your participation is voluntary. All information will be confidential. Your responses will be coded and you will not be personally identified. It is not necessary to put your name on the survey.

Your assistance in this study is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and your participation.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments about this study.

Yours sincerely

Ka Yee LAU
MPhil candidate
College of Business and Economics
Australian National University
SECTION ONE

Judge the frequency of each statement by using the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My group leader challenges me to re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.

2. Our group leader talks about the most important values and beliefs when working in a group as a whole.

3. My group leader gets me to seek differing perspectives when solving problems.

4. Our group leader talks to us optimistically about the future of the group.

5. Our group leader instils pride in us for being associated with him/her in the group.

6. Our group leader talks to us enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in the group.

7. Our group leader specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose in working with the group as a whole.

8. My group leader spends time with me teaching and coaching.

9. Our group leader goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.

10. My group leader treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.

11. Our group leader acts in ways that build respect in our group.

12. Our group leader considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions when working in the group.

13. Our group leader displays to our group a sense of power and confidence.

14. Our group leader articulates to our group a compelling vision of the future.

15. My group leader considers me as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others.

16. My group leader gets me to look at problems from many different angles.

17. My group leader helps me to develop my strength.

18. My group leader suggests to me new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.

19. Our group leader emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission when working in the group as a whole.

20. Our group leader expresses confidence that our group goals will be achieved.
### SECTION TWO

Please indicate the extent you agree with the following statements by using the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>moderately agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The team I work with has above average ability.
2. The members of my team have excellent job skills.
3. The team I work is poor compared to other team doing similar work.
4. The team I work is not able to perform as well as it should.
5. Some members of the team I work should be fired due to lack of ability.
6. The team I work in is not very effective.
7. Some members in this team cannot do their jobs well.
8. I am an expert at my job.
9. I am very proud of my job skills and abilities.
10. I have confidence in my ability to do my job.
11. I have all the skills needed to perform my job very well.
12. There are some tasks required by my job that I cannot do well.
13. When my performance is poor, it is due to my lack of ability.
14. I doubt my ability to do my job.
15. Most people in my line of work can do this job better than I can.
16. My future in this job is limited because of my lack of skills.
17. I feel threatened when others watch me work.
18. I expect to be promoted in my organization.
19. To get ahead, I will have to change jobs.
20. I expect that I will attain a higher level in my organization.
21. Currently, my career is at a stalling point.
SECTION THREE
Please complete the following information about yourself.

1. Gender: □ Male □ Female

2. Year of birth: __________

3. Number of years of formal education: _______ years
   (e.g. primary school = 6 years; elementary school = 9 years; …)

4. Your position: □ general staff □ junior manager □ middle manager □ senior manager

5. How long have you worked for this company: _______ years ______ months

6. How long have you worked with your direct supervisor: _______ years ______ months

7. Your job title: __________________

8. Your department: __________________

9. Your mother language: □ cantonese □ shanghaiese □ mandarin □ other ______

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
APPENDIX 7

The Subordinate Questionnaire for Study 2 (Main Study)
(In Chinese)
尊敬的先生 / 女士：

感谢您的支持！本次学术研究的目的在于探讨管理者领导风格、员工工作动机和工作绩效之间的关系。您的配合将帮助我们更好的完成研究计划。

问卷每一部分前面都有说明，请仔细阅读说明后再开始作答，题目没有所谓“对”或“错”的答案。您只要按照实际情形填答即可。

本次研究属纯学术研究，您所提供的资料将被保密，任何人（包括人力资源部、您的上司、下属和同事）都不会看到您所填的答案，问卷收集后您的答案将立刻被编码并交由电脑进行整体分析，绝对不会披露任何一位填报人身份，请您放心坦诚填答。

贵公司的许多其他同事也正在帮助填写这份问卷，恳请您拨冗协助。

非常感谢您的合作！
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>我的主管激励我反复思考问题背后的原因，看其是否妥当。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>我们的主管谈论他/她对团队最重视的价值观和信念。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>我的主管激励我从不同角度去解决困难。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>我们的主管乐观地谈论团队的未来。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>我们的主管向团队灌输一种与他/她共事的荣感。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>我们的主管热衷于谈论团队所要完成的工作。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>我们的主管强调我们要有明确的团体目标。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>我的主管花时间对我传授与指导。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>我们的主管注重团体利益大于个人利益。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>我的主管把我当作是独立的个体，而不只是把我当作是团体中的一员。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>我们的主管在团队决策上会考虑到道德与伦理的后果。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>我们的主管在工作团队中表现出权力感和自信心。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>我们的主管对工作团队传递激动队员的愿景。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>我的主管考虑到我有不同于他人的需求、能力与抱负。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>我的主管让我从多个不同的角度来观察问题。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>我的主管帮助我发展我的长处。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>我的主管就如何完成工作给我提供新的建议。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>我们的主管对工作团队强调有集体使命感的重要性。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>我们的主管对达成团队目标表现出自信。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>我的主管激励我反复思考问题背后的原因。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
因，看其是否妥当。

（二）在以下各题中，请表明您对题目同意或不同意的程度。请您根据自己的真实想法，不必参考别人的意见，按各题右边的7点标度，逐题选一个最适合的答案，并画一个圆圈。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>序号</th>
<th>项目</th>
<th>标度</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>我的工作团队的工作能力高于平均水平。</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>我的团队成员有极好的工作能力</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>相对其它工作团队，我的工作团队表现较差。</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>我的工作团队可以做的更好。</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>我的一些团队成员没有工作能力，应该被解雇。</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>我的工作团队效率不高。</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>我的一些团队成员不能把工作做好。</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>工作上，我是一名专家。</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>我对我的工作技能和能力感到自豪。</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>我对我的工作能力非常有信心。</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>我拥有应有的工作技能，把工作做好。</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>有一些工作任务我不能做好。</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>我的工作表现差是因为我的工作能力。</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>我怀疑自己的工作能力。</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>在做同一工作时，其他人都做得比我好。</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>我没有工作技能，所以在这里工作我前途有限。</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>当其他人看着我工作时，我感到紧张。</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>我期望在这家企业晋升。</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>我需要转换公司才能获得成功。</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>我期望成为这家企业的管理层</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>目前我的职业生涯已至极限。</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
最后，请您再拨冗填写一些个人背景资料，以作整体分析之用。

1. 您的性别： □男性 □女性
2. 您的年龄：
3. 您受过正式教育的年数：_____年
   （例如：小学毕业＝6年；初中毕业＝9年；高中毕业＝12年；大学毕业＝16年）
4. 您的职位： □一般员工 □基层主管 □中层主管
5. 您在现职公司多久：_____年_____月
6. 您和您的直属主管共事多久：_____年_____月
7. 您的职务：
8. 您任职的部门：
9. 您的母语： □普通话 □广东话 □其他（请注明）

本问卷至此已全部结束，谢谢您的合作！