



# Extending Winston's Circular Model of Servant Leadership: A Phenomenological Study

Elizabeth K. Hunt  
*Regent University*

---

The following research study presents a mixed methods study designed to further Winston's (2003) conceptualization of a circular model of servant leadership. Winston (2003) presented this circular model as an extension of Patterson's (2003) seven-factor model of servant leadership. The study included previously collected data identifying a servant leader at a small private liberal arts and professional college in the upper Midwest. The second portion of the study used phenomenological methods to interview followers of the identified leader to reveal the lived experiences of the identified leader's followers in relation to the variables of commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation, as presented by Winston (2003). The study found support for the three variables of commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation in the themes of quality relationships, transparent communication, self-efficacy supported by quality relationships, and role modeling. The study provided empirical evidence which may be used to develop a valid instrument to test the circular model presented by Winston (2003) in the future.

---

Leadership research focusing on how particular leadership styles and behaviors effect followers abounds. The vast majority of this research uses a leader-centric perspective, neglecting both the perspectives and influence of followers (Kellerman, 2007; Kelly, 2008). However, in recent years scholars have begun to shine a light on follower perspectives of the leadership process. This change has resulted in response to the flattening of organizational hierarchies, the changing modes of technology, and the increased use of participative engagement (Kellerman, 2007).

To date, the focus of follower-focused research has centered on how follower behavior impacts leadership, identifying follower characteristics, testing and developing models of followership, engaging a follower-centric view of the leadership processes, and seeking to better understand the leader-follower reciprocal relationship. Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, and Carsten (2014) argued that future followership research needs to more fully and clearly define followership and establish theoretical constructs of

followership. Furthermore, Uhl-Bien et al., differentiated between an employee and a follower, noting that followership “is the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders” (p. 96). Finally, Uhl-Bien, et al. identified two conceptual frameworks for future research direction including a reversed lens approach that seeks to understand how follower behavior affects leaders and a constructionist approach that seeks to identify ways that leaders and followers co-construct leadership and followership.

Winston (2003) proposed a conceptual model of the leader-follower relationship as a circular or spiral model within the servant leadership framework presented by Patterson (2003). Winston's conceptualization encompassed both theoretical frameworks presented by Uhl-Bien, et al., (2014), in that the model accounts for both how follower behavior and activity affect leaders and how the relationship between leaders and followers may be co-constructed. However, Winston's (2003) conceptualization has yet to undergo empirical testing.

The following paper reviews a mixed-methods research study exploring Winston's (2003) circular model of servant leadership. In particular, the paper reviews Patterson's (2003) servant leadership model, presents Winston's circular model of servant leadership, and reviews current research focused on leader-follower relationships. Finally, the paper presents a mixed-methods study which used previously collected data assessing the servant leadership behaviors of a single leader using the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006), followed by a phenomenological study designed to understand the lived experiences of respondents in relation to the identified leader in terms of follower's commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation.

## **Review of the Literature**

The following review of literature presents Patterson's (2003) model of servant leadership and the circular extension to that model provided by Winston (2003). In addition, the review provides examples of followership research seeking to articulate the reciprocal relationships between leadership and followership. Little research exists within followership literature to support the variables proposed by Winston (2003). As such, additional literature outside of followership is presented to help support and delineate the proposed phenomenological research.

### **Servant Leadership**

Greenleaf (2008) coined the term servant leadership to identify a philosophy of leadership which puts followers first (Hood, 2015). Greenleaf (2008) defined the servant leader as “...servant first...He is sharply different from the person who is leader first...the difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure

that other people's highest priority needs are begins served" (p. 15). The test of servant leadership rests in assessing Greenleaf's questions, "Do those served grow as person; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" (p. 15). However, the test of servant leadership remains an ambiguous and hard to measure leadership outcome.

### **Patterson's Model of Servant Leadership**

Patterson (2003) presented a seven-factor theoretical model of servant leadership. The seven factors include agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. As a type of moral love, which requires the leader to do the right thing, agapao love guides the remaining actions of the leader (Winston, 2002). Agapao love guides the leader to show concern and caring for followers, seeking to support and encourage their individual talents (Patterson, 2003). Humility guides leaders to be moderate, seek and listen to the advice of others, and rightly use power while keeping personal accomplishments in perspective and focusing on the needs others (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006; Patterson, 2003). Altruism often results in personal sacrifice while helping others and seeking equal treatment for all (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006; Patterson, 2003). Servant leaders include others in the creation of a shared vision, in which the gifts of organizational members guide that vision (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006; Patterson, 2003). Trust represents a relational component of leadership and can be linked to integrity, respect, and service (Patterson, 2003). The leader's willingness to share power by providing information, emotional support, encouragement, and freedom represents a leader's use of empowerment (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006; Patterson, 2003). Finally, service indicates a leader's "responsibility to others" and requires giving of time, talent, compassion, care, and concern (Patterson, 2003).

### **Winston's Circular Model of Servant Leadership**

Winston (2003) extended Patterson's (2003) model of servant leadership by providing a multi-directional conceptualization of servant leadership. The model proposes that a leader's service will increase a follower's levels of agapao love, which will in turn increase commitment to the leader and personal self-efficacy (Winston, 2003). This change will lead to an increase in intrinsic motivation, which will, in turn, lead to increased altruism toward the leader and the leader's vision (Winston, 2003). Finally, increased altruism will lead to increased service toward the leader (Winston, 2003).

Winston (2003) argued that commitment to the leader remains an inarticulate concept. However, the model indicates that followers of a servant leader will experience an increased commitment to the leader and an overall increase in performance and more effective performance (Winston, 2003). Winston (2003) indicated that a better understanding of follower commitment to servant leaders is needed.

Self-efficacy relates to follower perceptions of their own abilities (Winston, 2003). Good leaders should positively affect follower self-efficacy and positive self-efficacy should increase motivation (Winston, 2003). Finally, motivation supported by positive self-efficacy powers the influence measured by follower service to leaders in Winston's (2003) model.

An individual's tendency to seek out ways to engage their capabilities and meet challenges presents an intrinsic motivation (Winston, 2003). Followers expressing intrinsic motivation will not be moved by extrinsic rewards, but rather engage in an activity because they are inwardly motivated to do so (Winston, 2003). In Winston's (2003) model, intrinsic motivation, which is supported by self-efficacy, provides the fuel by which followers engage in activity or service for a leader.

### **Leadership and Followership as Reciprocal Relationship**

Maroosis (2008) and Stech (2008) both argued for viewing leadership and followership as a reciprocal process. In essence, followers affect and influence leaders just as leaders influence and affect followers. The concept, while intuitively plausible, only recently began to receive effort in establishing empirical evidence.

Baker, Mathis, and Stites-Doe (2011) engaged in empirical research to test several assumptions including followership as an active role, sharing of common purpose between followers and leaders, and the interdependence of the follower-leader relationship. Within a sample of U.S. healthcare workers, Baker, Mathis, and Stites-Doe found that follower and leader roles often overlapped and many followers had both "exemplary leader and effective follower characteristics" (p. 357). The study provided support for the reciprocal leader-follower relationship.

Testing the relationship between vision-based leaders and followers, Kantabutra and Vimolratana (2010) sought to assess the effects of leader passion, follower motivation, vision guidance, and leadership outcomes on the leader-follower relationship. Leaders with high levels of passion motivated followers to a greater degree (Kantabutra & Vimolratana, 2010). In turn, the degree of follower motivation directly influenced follower satisfaction (Kantabutra & Vimolratana, 2010). Kantabutra & Vimolratana (2010) highlighted the connection between leader behavior and follower motivation.

Billot, et al., (2013) conducted a qualitative study collecting 38 narratives to understand leader-follower relations in higher education. Using relational leadership theory, findings delineated positive and negative relational space (Billot, et al., 2013). Positive relational space included clearly defined roles and responsibilities, good feedback, supportive community, and a trustworthy environment (Billot, et al., 2013). Negative relational space included inhibiting and unhealthy environments, disempowerment, inadequate structure and budgets, bureaucratic rules and organization, and cynicism

(Billot, et al., 2013). The findings further support the notion of the follower-leader relationship as dynamic and reciprocal and the roles as shifting and complex (Billot, et al., 2013).

Morris (2014) used multi-method qualitative research to review the relational aspects of followership. Morris found that while hierarchy played a role, both leadership and followership were far more complex than hierarchy alone. Followership experiences tended to be better when hierarchy was not overwhelmingly explicit (Morris, 2014). Morris (2014) concluded that "followers and leaders are not static objects; instead, they are individuals who shift through processes of following and leading continuously depending on the situation and on aspects such as expertise and experience" (p. 58).

### **Support for Winston's (2003) Variables**

While the followership literature presented begins to provide evidence for the reciprocal relationship between leadership and followership, it provides little evidence for the support of the three variables of commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation proposed by Winston (2003). To move forward in testing Winston's (2003) model, a better understanding of these variables is needed. Evidence and support for these three variables were sought by looking outside followership literature. In particular, leadership focused studies that discussed these variables provided some theoretical support for further exploration.

### **Commitment to the Leader**

As noted by Winston (2003), little empirical evidence exists to support and understand a commitment to the leader as a result of servant leadership. However, Bass (2000) noted that transactional leaders use contingent rewards and praise for meeting commitments to a leader or organization, whereas transformational leaders use empowerment and participative decision-making. Furthermore, Bass (2000) argued that Leader-Member Exchange research supports that quality of the relationship between the leader and follower effect follower commitment. Finally, Bass (2000) argued for parallels between transformational and servant leadership in the areas of vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service with meeting the needs of others as the primary differentiator. In all, Bass (2000) argued for the use of participatory leadership behaviors to increase follower commitment.

House (1976) argued that charismatic leadership seeks to inspire followers to "emulate" the leader's values, goals, and behaviors, and to be obedient, loyal, and committed (p. 6). Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) indicated that commitment represented a "motivational disposition to continue a relationship, a role, or a course of action and to invest efforts regardless of the balance of external costs and benefits and their immediate gratifying properties" (p. 583). Furthermore, Shamir, et al. indicated that this

commitment eventually becomes a part of the follower's self-concept as a “way of being” (p. 583).

The literature supports the idea of relationship quality and internalization of leader vision as supporting follower commitment to a leader. As such, the following interview questions are proposed:

1. Describe your relationship with your leader and how that relationship affects your commitment to the leader (Bass, 2000; House, 1976; Shamir et. al., 1993)?
2. Does how your leader communicates vision and goals affect your commitment to the leader (House, 1976; Shamir et al., 1993)?

### **Self-Efficacy**

Winston (2003) indicated that self-efficacy entails a “follower’s perception of what the follower can and cannot do in terms of his/her capability” and is influenced by their social environment (p. 5). As well, positive self-efficacy directly affects motivation and overall performance (Winston, 2003). Again, followership literature does not boast much empirical evidence or conceptual articulations related to follower self-efficacy.

Poon (2006) conceptualized a model for exploration that included servant leadership, self-efficacy, and mentorship. The model seeks to articulate the relationship between servant leadership and its positive impact on both mentor and mentee self-efficacy (Poon, 2006). The model argues for a transformed relationship between mentor and mentee (Poon, 2006).

van Dierendonck and Dijkstra (2012) sought to find evidence and insight regarding the relationship between leader empowering behaviors and follower self-efficacy or psychological empowerment (p. E1). Psychological empowerment manifests in four cognitions including meaning, competence, impact, and self-determination (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012). Meaning entails the value of work or purpose of the work related to personal beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012). Individuals experience competence when their beliefs about their capacity to perform a task positively relate to their perceptions of confidence and effectiveness (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012). Impact or “knowledge of results” relates to a person’s belief about the influence or outcomes of their efforts (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012, p. E3). Finally, self-determination relates to a person’s perception of autonomy in action (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012).

The literature supports the ideas of mentorship and empowerment as determiners of follower self-efficacy. As such, the following interview questions are proposed:

3. In what ways does your leader mentor or empower you in your role (Poon, 2006; van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012)?

4. Has that mentorship or empowerment created or supported personal self-efficacy for you in the forms of meaningful work, autonomy, confidence, and knowing the impact of your work (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012)?

### **Intrinsic Motivation**

Winston (2003) argued that intrinsic motivation provides the impetus for individuals to engage pursuits that match their interests, challenge them, and provides them satisfaction. Again, servant leadership and followership literature have little to support the construct of intrinsic follower motivation. However, Harrell (2008) argued for leadership as a contextual factor in follower motivation, and that consideration displayed by leaders directly impacts overall motivation and performance.

Tu and Lu (2016) indicated that within ethical leadership intrinsic motivation “reflects one’s focus of attention” and followers experience more meaning when leaders engage in discussions concerning the impact of decisions and tasks on people and the organization (p. 134). Moreover, intrinsically motivated people show greater “job involvement and goal attainment”, take advantage of developmental activities provided by the leader, and engage more fully in participative decision making (Tu & Lu, 2016, p. 134). Finally, intrinsically motivated followers seek to engage in and create relationships with others in the organization, including their leader (Tu & Lu, 2016).

Cho and Perry (2012) argued that intrinsic motivation remains the “most powerful driver of employee attitudes and performance” (p. 384). Cho and Perry found that leader trustworthiness and goal-directedness directly impact employee intrinsic motivation and satisfaction. In essence, the level of trust a follower has in a leader and the adoption and articulation of clear and challenging goals influence follower intrinsic motivation.

Berson, Halevy, Shamir, and Erez (2015) conducted empirical research to support visioning and goal setting as important factors in follower motivation. In particular, Berson, et al., found that the “construal fit” between the message (abstractness) and the situation (distance between leaders and followers) directly impacted follower motivation. The research combined two separate streams of inquiry, visioning and goal setting, into one.

The literature supported the idea of encouragement and support by the leader, trust between leader and follower, and clear visioning and goal setting as influences in follower intrinsic motivation. As such, the following interview questions are proposed:

5. How has your leader encouraged or supported your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks (Tu & Lu, 2016)?

6. What factors of the relationship between you and your leader have most supported your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks (Cho & Perry, 2012)?
7. Are there specific leadership behaviors that influenced your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks (Berson, et al., 2015)?

### **Purpose of the Proposed Study**

The mixed methods study sought to extend Winston's (2003) extension of Patterson's (2003) model of servant leadership, which presents a circular or spiraled leader-follower relationship. Winston (2003) called for research to extend Dennis and Bocarnea's (2006) Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument to test the variables of his extension. The proposed study represented a step prior to the development of an instrument to measure Winston's (2003) proposed variables by engaging in a mixed methods study to better articulate the lived experiences of followers of a servant leader. More specifically, the study aimed to engage followers of an identified servant leader in interviews seeking the lived experiences related to the variables of commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation. The research question guiding the study was, How do followers experience commitment to a leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation as a result of their relationship with their servant leader?

### **Methods and Procedures**

The study used mixed methods research design to, first, identify a servant leadership, and, second, to uncover the lived experiences of followers of that leader. The following section provides details of two separate steps. The first step was completed prior to embarking on the proposed phenomenological research as part of course requirements for the Regent University in PhD in Organizational Leadership program and engaged followers of a leader in assessing follower perceptions of servant leadership attributes using the SLAI (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006). The results indicated that the leader was a servant leader. Taking those results, the second step engaged a sample of the followers of the identified leader in interviews to uncover their lived experiences as related to commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation. The second step of this study provided a better understanding of how followers perceived and understood the variables in correlation to their relationship with the leader and may be used to inform scale development for empirically testing Winston's (2003) model.

#### **Step One: Initial Assessment of Leader Using the SLAI**

In May and June of 2017, I engaged in data collection for LPHD 754 Quantitative Analysis Methods (Hunt, 2017). The data collection utilized the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006) to assess follower perceptions of servant leadership of a university president at a small liberal arts and professional



university in the Upper Midwest. Institutional review board approval was sought and obtained from the university's Institutional Review Board.

Entering the 42-question survey into Survey Monkey and including demographic questions related to gender, tenure, and employee category (staff or faculty), the survey was distributed to a total of 325 recipients via email. Data collection took place between May 18, 2017, and June 2, 2017. A total of 65 completed surveys were collected (Hunt, 2017).

A total of 28 males (43.1%) and 35 females (53.8%) participated, as well as two who did not identify gender (3.1%) (Hunt, 2017). Self-identification of employment status resulted in 35 staff (53.8%) and 28 faculty (43.1%), with two respondents (3.1%) who did not identify their employment status (Hunt, 2017). Twenty-six respondents (40%) had been employed up to five years, 29 (44.6%) between six and ten years, and nine (13.8%) eleven or more years, with one respondent (1.5%) not indicating the length of employment (Hunt, 2017).

Overall, university employees ranked their leader in all factors of servant leadership above the median. Means ranging between 3.40 for vision at the low end and 4.57 for humility at the high end, strongly suggest that followers perceived active servant leadership. Ranked by mean from highest to lowest, humility, trust, service, love, empowerment, altruism, and vision, the difference between the top-most factor of humility and the fifth-ranked factor of service equals 0.30, signifying minimal disparity in how these factors are viewed among the group. However, the next two factors, altruism and vision, score 0.81 and 1.17 lower than the top-most factor humility and 0.50 and 0.86 lower than the lowest of the top five services, respectively, indicating a larger disparity in perception.

Employment type did not indicate any significant differences for the factors. However, gender produced some significant difference in the altruism factor, with females rating the leader lower in altruism than males. Finally, means calculated by tenure showed a small but interesting phenomenon in that for the factors of love, empowerment, vision, altruism, and trust, employees with 6-10 years of service ranked the leader highest, followed by employees with 0-5 years, and lowest rankings for those with 11 or more years of service. The factors of humility and service showed highest rankings by those employed with five or fewer years of service, next by employees with 6-10 years, and last by employees with 11 or more years of service.

Taken as a whole, the survey results indicated followers perceived the university leader as a servant leader. The results for the factors of love, empowerment, vision, altruism, and trust related to the length of tenure indicated that care should be taken in the phenomenological step to engage employees in all tenure categories to ensure accurate representation of experiences across the sample. As well, the gender difference

associated with altruism supports the need for representation across genders in the phenomenological step.

## **Step Two: Proposed Phenomenological Study of Leader's Follower**

Phenomenological methodology helped to uncover the lived leadership experiences of followers of the identified servant leader in relation to a commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation. The use of phenomenological methods allowed a better understanding and conceptualization of follower perspectives of these variables. The following section provides background for phenomenological methods and covers participant selection and sampling and data collection methods.

### **Phenomenological Methodology**

Phenomenological research methods seek a description of the lived experiences of individuals or groups (Patton, 2015). A phenomenological researcher focuses on how individuals experience phenomena and how they make sense of those experiences (Patton, 2015). Ultimately, phenomenological research seeks to describe how people experience particular phenomena (Creswell, 2013).

Moustakes (1994) described the phenomenological methods using six specific steps (Creswell, 2013). First, the researcher identifies the phenomenon (Moustakes, 1994). Second, the researcher engages in techniques called bracketing, epoche, and phenomenological reduction (Moustakes, 1994). Bracketing, epoche, and phenomenological reduction all serve to engage the researcher in honing in on the data as presented, seeking to limit personal bias and outside influence (Patton, 2015). A researcher uses bracketing to block out personal experiences regarding the phenomenon (Patton, 2015). Epoche provides an intensive form of bracketing where researchers engage in the cognizant removal of personal biases and judgments of the phenomenon (Moustakes, 1994). Finally, using phenomenological reduction the researcher presents the phenomenon in a way that remains faithful to the actual experience (Patton, 2015).

A researcher collects data and engages the data in a process called horizontalization, which treats all data with equal importance (Creswell, 2013). Using imaginative variation, which extracts the meaning of data using imagination, multiple frames of references, and divergent perspectives, the researcher begins to uncover data themes (Groenewald, 2004; Moustakes, 1994). These themes assist the researcher in creating textual descriptions of experiences and structural descriptions of how individuals experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013).

## Data Collection Methods

Moustakes (1994) argued for the use of interview in phenomenological methods. The proposed study will conduct in-depth interviews in person or via telephone (Groenewald, 2004). An informal, open-ended interview structure will provide depth and reduce question biases within the participant group (Patton, 2015). However, a topical guide supported by the literature will be used (Moustakes, 1994). I submitted the initial set of interview questions to a doctoral colleague and two potential participants to test the clarity of the interview questions. While all responded that the questions were understood, some small wording changes were made for clarification, and it was decided to include some definitions for clarity. The topical guide will consist of the following interview questions and provide definitions for the concepts of self-efficacy, autonomy, and intrinsic motivation:

### Definitions:

- Self-efficacy is defined as personal perceptions of competence in abilities (Winston, 2003; van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012).
- Autonomy is defined as self-determination or the ability to make choices related to personal actions (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012).
- Intrinsic motivation is defined as a personal drive to engage in activity that fits personal interests while being challenged (Cho & Perry, 2012; Winston, 2003).

### Interview Questions:

1. Describe your relationship with your leader and how that relationship affects your commitment to the leader (Bass, 2000; House, 1976; Shamir, et al., 1993)?
2. Does how your leader communicates vision and goals affect your commitment to the leader (House, 1976; Shamir, et al., 1993)?
3. In what ways does your leader mentor and empower you in your role (Poon, 2006; van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012)?
4. Has that mentorship or empowerment created or supported personal self-efficacy for you in the forms of meaningful work, autonomy, confidence, and knowing the impact of your work (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012)?
5. How has your leader encouraged or supported your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks (Tu & Lu, 2016)?
6. What factors of the relationship between you and your leader have most supported your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks (Cho & Perry, 2012)?
7. Are there specific leadership behaviors that influenced your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks (Berson, et al., 2015)?

Specific data collection methods include recording and transcribing interviews via iPhone voice recording and NOW Transcribe software, respectively (Groenewald,

2004). In addition, field notes with observational, theoretical, methodological, and analytical notes will be taken during and following each interview. Transcribed interviews will be checked for accuracy and validity by sharing the transcriptions with each participant (Groenewald, 2004).

## Participants and Sampling

Patton (2015) suggested using purposive sampling in studies designed to look at phenomena in depth. In addition, this study used a mixed methods approach, which identified a particular leader as a servant leader using the model proposed by Patterson (2003) and tested by the SLAI (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2006). As such, the participants in the sample included those who have worked closely or for an extended amount of time with the identified leader. In particular, I identified a diverse group of interviewees from within the ranks of the leader's followers, including those who have served on the leader's executive team and those who have worked with the leader for more than three years.

A literature review produced several similarly focused phenomenological studies. Harris-Wilson (2017) studied the effects of empowering followers using a sample of 12 participants. Hawkins (2016) explored follower perspectives of followership in higher education using a sample of ten participants. Hood (2015) studied follower perceptions of the outcomes of Greenleaf's theory using ten participants.

Mason (2010) indicated that sample sizes for qualitative studies may be much smaller than those in quantitative studies. In particular, the aim of a qualitative study directly affects the sample size (Mason, 2010; Francis, et al., 2010; Marshall, 1996; Patton, 2015). Marshall (1996) further stated that an "appropriate sample size for a qualitative study is one that adequately answers the research question" (p. 523). Moreover, distinct rules for sample size in qualitative research do not exist, as size depends on research intent and purpose, usefulness, time and resources (Patton, 2015, p. 311).

Glaser and Straus (as cited in Mason, 2010) argued that data saturation occurs when no new data evolves into a new concept. Ritchie (as cited in Mason, 2010) cited a number of influences on saturation including the number of criteria selected, collection methods, multiple samples, the diversity of the sample, and the researcher's expertise on the subject. In essence, sampling and saturation work together in a continuum that is balanced and influenced by a number of mitigating factors. A key component of addressing both sampling and saturation in qualitative research rests in a researchers intent and ability to fully communicate, explain, describe, and justify sampling procedures (Patton, 2015). As such, an initial sample size of 10 participant interviews is proposed. However, sampling will continue until saturation occurs, or when no additional themes of meaning arise from data collection (Glaser & Straus as cited in Mason, 2010; Patton, 2015).

Table 1: Participant Demographics

| Participant | Gender | Direct/Indirect Report | Age Range | Years Worked for Leader |
|-------------|--------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Greg        | M      | Direct                 | 60-70     | 12                      |
| Kara        | F      | Indirect               | 40-50     | 8                       |
| Ray         | M      | Indirect               | 50-60     | 16                      |
| Mark        | M      | Indirect               | 60-70     | 11                      |
| Sam         | M      | Direct                 | 40-50     | 3                       |
| Paula       | F      | Direct                 | 50-60     | 16                      |
| Mary        | F      | Indirect               | 60-70     | 12                      |
| Tammy       | F      | Direct                 | 50-60     | 11                      |
| Pete        | M      | Direct                 | 40-50     | 4                       |
| Elaine      | F      | Direct                 | 30-40     | 15                      |

## Coding Methods

Coding provides a means by which data can be simultaneously decoded and encoded (Saldana, 2009, p. 4). First cycle coding methods included initial coding read-through, InVivo coding, descriptive coding, values coding, and simultaneous coding, which represent elemental coding methods (Saldana, 2009). These initial coding methods allowed for an “open-ended” first review (Saldana, 2009, p. 66). InVivo coding enabled codes to be pulled directly from the data and results in codes such as *met you where you were at* and *had my back* (Moustakes, 1994). Descriptive codes provided a means to summarize ideas and concepts (Saldana, 2009). Participants “values, attitudes, and beliefs” make up the values coding (Saldana, 2009, p. 89). Finally, simultaneous coding provided an avenue by which multiple codes could be applied at the same time to a single word or phrase (Saldana, 2009). Following initial coding and frequency counts, codes were categorized into group codes by theming the data (Saldana, 2009). Theming the data allowed a corpus of similar codes to emerge, which then allowed an overarching theme to move into four final group codes (Saldana, 2009).

## Results

Following the first and second cycle coding methods, I reviewed each interview question to derive evidence of overarching themes connecting to each of the questions. The following review shows participants answers to each question. As well, the review indicates code frequencies and thematic patterns in the coded data.

Overall, participants described their relationship with their leader as being one of quality, supported by affirming and supportive leader behavior, open communication, and overall integrity and authenticity. The data supported the idea that the leader had taken time and effort to build relationships with the followers, in more than a fleeting way. Finally, the data indicated that from this relationship, trust emerged and created a sense of commitment and loyalty.

Greg: I would say that as I got...as I grew to understand Brad I began to realize that Brad's approach to working with people was, I would say, casual (*Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationship*)...He was very interested in conversation, very interested in talking through his thought process (*Code 1: openness; shared information; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). So if you worked with Brad you would understand that meetings were usually long and...and Brad would usually want to talk through any process that he was thinking about and would want your input and want to hear from those who were working with him (*Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). So, I always felt like Brad...that my working relationship with him was mutually respectful but I never felt that it was, after the first little while, I never thought that it was an extremely formal relationship or authoritarian relationship (*Code 1: respect, validated, not authoritative; Group Code: authenticity, democratic, affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication, self-efficacy*). I felt that it was a more casual kind of relationship in which he sought to accomplish certain goals and enlisted people to help him accomplish those goals (*Code 1: participative, personable; Group Code: democratic, building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*)...Because Brad was...maybe another way to describe that was personable (*Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). Casualness led to...I never felt that Brad's connection to me in the business relationship was different than his relationship to me, on a personal level, if that makes sense (*Code 1: consistent; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). Brad and I weren't pals, you know, we weren't out playing golf every weekend or anything, but I always felt that he was genuine (*Code 1: genuine; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). So, that my relationship with him in the office wasn't any different than my relationship with him if I didn't play golf with him or if I did go out and grab a bite to eat with him or if I was in his home...I never said that with respect to the kind of personal connection, that there was a difference when I was in his office during the workweek or any if I saw him at any other time. He was just always honest, genuine, above-board, caring, sympathetic (*Code 1: honest, genuine, straightforward, care, empathy; Group Code: integrity, authenticity, service, affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling, self-efficacy*). So, I

think that's what I call casual or which you could also call personal or maybe also call genuine (*Code 1: genuine; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). Yes, surely encouraged commitment. Absolutely.

*Kara:* My relationship with the leader was...I think of it as a positive relationship (*Code 1: positive relationship; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He, obviously I was not a direct report to him, but I worked closely with him on [projects]...I think it was...was a positive relationship, definitely (*Code 1: positive relationship; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I always felt like I was supported...always felt like I could go to him and ask questions and know that the answer that I received (*Code 1: support, openness; Group Code: transparency, affirmation; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships, self-efficacy*), he wouldn't waiver necessarily later (*Code 1: consistent; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). So, I kind of felt like I could move forward instead of thinking, ah I need to circle back and find out what, if that's really what he meant (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)...I felt ...it's one of the reasons I've stayed so long, because I felt like I was heard (*Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*), I felt like everybody who came to him for whatever reason, whether they were a trustee or somebody who's...not to say that it's a lesser job, but you know someone who works hourly or something like that...I think no matter what, in any situation I was aware of, he was always really respectful of everybody (*Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*) and I always felt he was trying to better not just the University but the individuals that he worked with, whom he worked. So, that made me feel very committed to his leadership, as well as the University itself (*Code 1: leader commitment, service; Group Code: service, commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...And, I feel like part of that is because of the growth opportunities that he allowed to happen (*Code 1: encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). He is and was very wise about allowing people to grow and figuring out well you've maybe not mastered X, Y, or Z, but you know it's time for you to develop some more (*Code 1: encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). And I feel he really helped in that regard. And, again that fosters commitment.

*Ray:* I worked with him enough and in enough different capacities that I felt I could really trust him (*Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). One of the things I told him before he left is that I never felt like he treated me like an employee (*Code 1: collegial; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I felt he treated me like a colleague (*Code 1: collegial; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

Like maybe first among equals (*Code 1: collegial; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*)...that coupled with just his own particular skill ... gave us kind of mutual background that we could work together on several different things over the years (*Code 1: common ground; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And, I knew that whenever I would hear the latest crazy idea or whatever the latest new idea, that I didn't even, if I wasn't sure of it, I would know that I could trust that ultimately that idea wasn't crazy, that it was, in fact, a vetted idea that it had many hours and many people behind it (*Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). So, I knew he wasn't he was just an autonomous leader, that he would just decide we're going to do this everybody does it or they can lump it (*Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*)....Because as you and I both know just in talking to him and the visioning process the way he did it there were often crazy ideas (*Code 1: vision, trust; Group Code: trust, vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)...So, you know, I finally learned when he crossed over the line from, you know, I got this really kooky idea that maybe could work to sort of lighten the mood of the kookiest idea has come into my head (*Code 1: dreaming; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)....And, not even...that style I feel engender is a sense of trust because I think people generally take themselves too seriously (*Code 1: trust, humility; Group Code: integrity; authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And so, I appreciate working relationships that know when to get down to work but also know when to set work aside to just be human and to communicate and to be silly, to whatever, so that, you know, you, you, build a relationship (*Code 1: sense of humor; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). You're not just working on a project, you're building a relationship so that the work on the project goes smoothly and can be more efficient (*Code 1: building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

**Mark:** Any time that I met with him, my personal impression is that he was a very caring and genuine individual and most of the time he always gave me positive feedback rather than negative and unhelpful. (*Code 1: care, genuine, positive feedback; Group Code: service, authenticity, affirmation; Final Group Code: role modeling, quality relationships, self-efficacy*).

**Sam:** He does not, he carries himself as a regular person (*Code 1: authenticity; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*) and that's an unusual trait in a President. You know my favorite experience with Brad is, I tell the story a lot, I showed up to the, my wife and I showed up to a dinner my first year here and every table had its own theme. I walked in and Brad had the silly hat on,



silly sunglasses, and lay around his neck. And the previous President I worked for would not have done that in a million years, would not have humbled himself in that respect (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And I think that's the thing I enjoyed about Brad. I certainly respected his intellect, his vision, his dedication (*Code 1: vision, leader commitment; Group Code: vision, commitment; Final Group Code: transparent communication, role modeling*) to the institution. But what made that real for me was his ability to relate to anyone in any situation and make you feel comfortable (*Code 1: met you where you were at; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And it was an absolute joy not only for myself but for my wife...And you know that those are rare qualities too. It was just about the time you would forget he's the President (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*)...He just had a way of saying things in...a way of putting things that everybody could understand (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*) and everybody could immediately go ok, that's what he's talking about, that's what he's looking for. It was, again, just a relatable thing for a guy (*Code 1: building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*) in his position as any CEO but certainly a college President. I think there's no doubt that he's a brilliant man. He's a brilliant leader. But what makes him brilliant is his ability to, for everyone to understand (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*) what he's trying to do and that he was always looking forward (*Code 1: vision; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*) and that's what I really enjoyed that. I can't say enough good things about him. It's a pleasure to work for him.

*Paula:* Well, I had a very close relationship with Brad (*Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)....So, we would spend a fair amount of time, I wouldn't say socially but very informally having conversations (*Code 1: building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). We ate together. We drove long distances together. So, we would have, rarely were they personal in nature, but they were informal in nature. And, so, I think, you know, those...that relationship created a bond, an understanding, a commitment that, I just became, I became committed to what I, what I, learned he was trying to accomplish (*Code: understanding; leader commitment; Group Code: affirmation, commitment; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling, self-efficacy*). I became more, probably more committed to helping him be successful because I respected him and I liked him and I felt like what he was trying to do I understood and I bought into and therefore I...I...wanted to do everything I could do to make him successful (*Code 2: respect, bought in; Group Code: authenticity, commitment; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*). It

was very much less about could I be successful, even though I'm not a person who likes to fail. So, my own sense of accomplishment is important. But, I found myself over time I find, found [my husband] asking...asking occasionally why do you...why does that matter to you that...that should not matter to you because you have to [do this] and you're over here doing this?...Whatever that was the answer was always because I'm part of a bigger vision (*Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*) and I want...I want us to be successful as a university. And, if I'm not supporting Brad who is? I am his team (*Code 1: team; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*)...We... are his team just as though the groups that work with me make our department successful (*Code 1: team; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). I'm part of the team that works for Brad and if we don't do the things that need to get done, (*Code 1: team; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*) he and this university are not successful. So, it just became a real loyalty I guess (*Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*).

*Mary:* I always felt my relationship was really good with Dr. Bradley and actually I would go further than that and say that I felt extremely loyal to him, toward him and really he is such an endearing figure that I felt willing to follow him (*Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...You know, more than that...but I felt like Dr. Bradley was very honest and so he...that created a lot of trust (*Code 1: honesty, trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). When he took a direction I always felt like...my feeling always was his intention was always for the good of the whole, the good of the college (*Code 1: altruistic; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And, I actually, I don't know if this might fit in another place, but I actually had an experience with Dr. Bradley where there was a situation on campus that very tricky. A student had gotten a little out of control and Dr. Bradley just acted very promptly and it was so clear that what was foremost in his mind was the safety of all students and very quick action, but not unthoughtful action (*Code 1: thoughtful, concern; Group Code: integrity; service; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*). It was thoughtful toward all parties but safety really primary for everyone involved (*Code 1: thoughtful; service; Group Code: integrity, service; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*).

*Tammy:* I would call it a very open relationship (*Code 1: transparency; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). I felt more that I was working with him rather than for him (*Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*)... I think when you have a sense that you're working with someone there's more of a

sense of teamwork, which appeals to me (*Code 1: team; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). So, it probably increased my commitment to him.

*Pete:* Well, I worked for Brad for four years... In terms of our, what our relationship was, I think it was a very good working relationship. I always felt supported by him (*Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*), particularly dealing with personnel issues. Brad was always willing to sit down with everybody and listen to all sides of a story or a situation that was going on (*Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). Whatever the case might be. But at the end of the day I never had any doubt that he would be there to support me and would not undermine me in any way (*Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). So I always, always, felt like he had my back going into any situation and even if he didn't agree 100 percent with what I wanted to do or what I thought the best route forward was, once the decision was made he supported me in that (*Code 1: support, had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships*)...very supportive relationship (*Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*).

*Elaine:* Well, I was his [direct report for] about four years until his retirement...I got to observe him in several different ways and see the ways that he carried out his leadership (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...because he and his leadership shows commitment to others, appreciation for others what they do (*Code 1: care; Group Code: Service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). Encouraging me to reach out with my needs whether that was I finding ah different department heads to get in touch with me on things or board members and communicating with them about upcoming meetings or committee items (*Code 1: encouraged growth, empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). He encouraged me to be a self-starter.

The most prevalent theme that emerged from the data, quality relationships (50), included the following group codes: building relationships (15), affirmation (13), authenticity (10), democratic (10), and integrity (10). The building relationships group code included the following initial codes: personable (4), building relationships (3), collegial (3), positive relationship (2), common ground (1), met you where you were at (1), and sense of humor (1). The affirmation group code included the following initial codes: support (4), encouraged growth (4), empowered (1), had my back (1), understanding (1), validated (1), positive feedback (1), empathy (1). The authenticity group code included the following initial codes: genuine (4), humility (3), respect (1), and authenticity (1). The democratic group code included the following initial codes:

participative (5), team (4), and not authoritative (1). Finally, the integrity group code included the following initial codes: trust (4), honesty (2), thoughtful (2), consistent (2), altruistic (1), and straightforward (1). The quality of the relationship between leader and follower stemmed primarily from the care taken by the leader to build the relationship, his affirming behavior toward each follower, and a general sense of the leader's integrity and authenticity. These characteristics and behaviors were supported by an overall sense of democratic participation in the organization's work and processes. Overall, participants indicated that commitment to the leader directly reflected the quality of their relationships with the leader. The data showed support for the impact of quality relationships on follower commitment (Bass, 2000).

The second prevalent theme that emerged from the data, transparent communication (23), included the following group codes: democratic (10), transparency (9), and vision (4). The democratic group code included the following initial codes: participative (5), team (4), and not authoritative (1). The transparency group code included the following initial codes: listen (3), clear communication (2), openness (2), transparency (1), and shared information (1). The vision group code included the following initial codes: (vision 3) and dreaming (1). The perception of transparent communication stemmed from the leader's willingness to engage in democratic behaviors of participation and teamwork, supported by clear communication, active listening, and openness to ideas. These leader behaviors supported the overall understanding and acceptance of the organization's vision. Bass (2000) argued that follower commitment directly links to vision and participatory leadership behaviors, which are supported by the data.

Two additional themes emerged from the data, including role modeling (13) and self-efficacy (13). Role modeling included the following group codes: commitment (7), service (6), and role model (1). The group code of commitment included the following initial codes: leader commitment (3), loyalty (3), bought in (1). The group code of service included the following initial codes: care (3), service (2), and concern (1). The group code of role model including on initial code: role model (1). Participants expressed viewing the leader as someone they could emulate or look to as an exemplar in a number of leadership areas. House (1976) indicated that follower's commitment increases when they view the leader as a role model. Thus, the data support the literature. Participants experienced the leader as a role model in seeing both the leader's commitment to the vision and mission of the organization and the leader's overall service to the organization and its constituents. House (1976) and Shamir, et al. (1993) argued that leadership inspires follower commitment as followers seek to *emulate* the leader's values, goals, and behaviors.

Self-efficacy included the group code of affirmation (13). The affirmation group code included the following initial codes: support (4), encouraged growth (4), empowered (1), had my back (1), understanding (1), validated (1), positive feedback (1), empathy (1). In the case of self-efficacy, the data indicated that the overall behaviors of the leader

increased both the quality of the relationships and the follower's self-efficacy. In particular, the leader's affirming behaviors moved beyond just empowering and support, to affirmation, which in turn increased their overall commitment to the leader.

## **Question 2: Does how your leader communicates vision and goals affect your commitment to the leader?**

Overall, participants described their leader's communication of vision and goals as transparent and participatory. The transparency and democratic nature of communicated vision and goals received direct support from the quality relationship between the leader and follower. Participants cited the leader's personal commitment and persistence in reaching the organization's vision and goals as something they modeled their own behavior after and further indicated a sense of self-efficacy and autonomy in how they personally could help the organization reach the vision.

*Greg:* Yes, I would say it did. Again, maybe to kind of reiterate that I think that the way Brad commun...communicated his vision oftentimes was through a kind of mutual, ah, discussion of...ah, goals (*Code 1: leader commitment, participative; Group Code: commitment, democratic; Final Group Code: role modeling, quality relationships, transparent communication*)...Brad surely had ideas. He was creative and that is to say that Brad was always fomenting ideas, he did, he was stirring the pot, he didn't let things stand still and just kind of restless, almost that way, as you know (*Code 1: vision; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). But at the same time, he just, he ah, he didn't just come into one's office or come into a cabinet meeting or something like that and just throw the rules down on the table and say, "OK, here are your marching orders" (*Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). There was always a discussion, there was always give and take (*Code 1: shared information; vision, participative; Group Code: transparency, vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships*). And, there was always a kind of working through the material. So, yeah, because it was a shared, he wanted to share the vision and he wanted people to buy into the vision, and oftentimes, he changed, he allowed the vision to be shaped by those around him (*Code 1: shared information; vision; Group Code: transparency, vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). So, that then we all own it (*Code 1: bought in; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*). And, yeah, that surely encouraged commitment, because when something is owned by everyone right, then we are all committed to it and to the person who initiated it (*Code 1: bought in, vision; Group Code: commitment, vision; Final Group Code: role modeling, transparent communication*).

*Kara:* That's really, I...I know you don't need me to assess the questions, but I love it. One of the things you know, when Brad was here he invited everybody to

participate in a vision statement for the University and then it was a smaller committee in the end that created it (*Code 1: vision, participative; Group Code: vision, democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships*)...I always felt like it was interesting because he had a clear vision but at the same time he was always open to hearing what everybody else in the room thought and then was very conscious of the fact that he was a leader (*Code 1: vision, openness, clear communication, tolerant; Group Code: vision, transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). So, he was going to be not just a sounding board but to synthesize all that information and make sure that he follows through on whatever, whatever the goal of that (*Code 1: sounding board, synthesized information; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)... He was always open to the conversation (*Code 1: listen, openness; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)...You know he communicated goals, I think he was really good at it (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). There were cases that we didn't necessarily meet every goal every year...he would always back us up you know when talking to the board (*Code 1: had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And to me, that's a leader too...You literally felt like he had your back so to speak (*Code 1: had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

*Ray:* As far as the way he communicated his vision...that was usually done through mostly official channels. At least in my capacity with him as being a faculty member. So, what I would hear, if we're about the vision, a strategic plan, or new programs for the university or new, new, new, directives for the academic dean to work on...by the time I heard about them they were being communicated in maybe more official capacities (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*).

*Mark:* I think Brad had a very unique way of communicating. And, I always really respect people who can talk to the masses in a very simple format (*Code 1: clear communication, respect; Group Code: transparency, authenticity; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships*). Brad was not intimidating individual (*Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He never took himself serious but he took his job serious (*Code 1: humility, leader commitment; Group Code: authenticity, commitment; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*) and because he talked very simple and he made sure that through that simplicity everybody could understand his vision or how he can see the future of this institution (*Code 1: clear communication, vision; Group Code: transparency, vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). I think leaders that they can talk simple (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent*

*communication*) you're going to have more followers because... they have more followers than those people who come across the one to communicate to people in a very high level of educational knowledge (Code 1: *clear communication*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). Brad was the president but he talked very simple in the sense of and put everybody at ease and that's why that communication did help (Code 1: *clear communication, personable*; Group Code: *building relationships*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). He didn't intimidate you he didn't use a lot of jargons (Code 1: *personable, clear communication*; Group Code: *building relationship, transparency*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*). He says what it is (Code 1: *clear communication*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*).

Sam: He was, he was very clear (Code 1: *clear communication*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). He always explained where he was going (Code 1: *vision*; Group Code: *vision*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). He wasn't afraid. He would always, the thing that I liked too, Brad would always listen to you, listen to your ideas and take it to heart and trust your leadership (Code 1: *listen, trust, trusted me*; Group Code: *transparency, integrity, trust*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication, quality relationships*). And when you have somebody that... and will let you do your job and when you have somebody in that position that's willing to let you do your job, listen to your thoughts and how you feel about things, that makes it so much easier to respect (Code 1: *autonomy, listen, respect*; Group Code: *autonomy, transparency, authenticity*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, transparent communication, quality relationships*). You should always respect the President because the President, you respect (Code 1: *respect*; Group Code: *authenticity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). We respected Brad, I respect Brad because he was Brad and the fact that he would listen to you and take your counsel he wouldn't always agree with you which is fine but he would always listen (Code 1: *respect, listen, tolerant*; Group Code: *authenticity, transparency*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*). And at the same time, we would have a lively debate and lively discussions (Code 1: *openness, tolerant*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). I appreciated it. Openness in cabinet to listen to different points of view and let people debate and express their opinion (Code 1: *openness, listen, tolerant, participative*; Group Code: *transparency, democratic*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication, quality relationships*). And, in the end, we would all come to a conclusion and we walked out of that room and be behind that decision (Code 1: *participative, team*; Group Code: *democratic*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*). So, it makes it so much easier than to buy into what he's doing and what he's trying to accomplish (Code 1: *bought in*; Group Code: *commitment*; Final Group Code: *role modeling*).

*Paula:* In some ways, you remember Brad...His world is more of an artist's canvas than it is a spreadsheet. And so, together we...we had to find the right colors and we had to find, as his cabinet, we had to kind of set the agenda for him (Code 1: *participative*; Group Code: *democratic*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*). He would say things like, "Well, what do you think about this," or every now and then he'd say, "Well you know we need to do something in health sciences," or something like that you know (Code 1: *openness, participative*; Group Code: *transparency, democratic*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication, quality relationships*)...But, he would say it kind of tongue in cheek sometimes. But, you knew what he meant. And so, then you'd say, "Well, Brad I really think..." he just left...he left the canvas half done. And so, you just found a way to fill in the color (Code 1: *participative*; Group Code: *democratic*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication, quality relationships*). He never...he never said this is what I want done (Code 1: *not authoritative*; Group Code: *democratic*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*)...When I look back I think it did develop leadership in others because he let others lead (Code 1: *let others lead*; Group Code: *democratic*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*). He knew when to pull back because he did have his own...his own ego...You knew when it was time to say, "Brad, I think we, I think we're at a point here where this is going to work. What do you think?" And then he would say, "Well, I think you should go this way or that way." You know, he was really pretty good about that. You'd provide all of the information that you thought it was the direction he wanted to head in and then he would say, you know, he'd kind of guide the rest of it or something, you know (Code 2: *guidance*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*)...So because of that a lot of freedom was given to the people that worked for him to do things their way (Code 1: *freedom*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*).

*Mary:* I didn't deal directly with Dr. Bradley. So, we didn't have a lot of conversations. Most of goals and vision came through, by hearing about them or faculty meetings. But again when Dr. Bradley was present at a faculty meeting or talking to a group of faculty there really always was a sense of generosity toward not only students but to our faculty and staff (Code 1: *openness*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). So again, that integrity that he displayed, just his willingness to be vulnerable really and genuine was helpful (Code 1: *integrity, vulnerability, genuine*; Group Code: *integrity, authenticity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). In saying yeah, well, I'm not sure how this is going to play out because you never knew and no one ever knows how something will play out. But nevertheless, it never felt heavy-handed to me (Code 1: *not authoritative*; Group Code: *democratic*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*)



*Tammy:* Yeah, yeah, I think yes. I think it did affect the relationship because it clarifies what the expectations are and it also unifies the group (Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication)... I think because they were developed as a group (Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships). It was like there was a consensus there (Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships).

*Pete:* I would say so. In a large part, the reason that I came here was because of Brad and his commitment to the vision that he had for the University and to be a part of that (Code 1: leader commitment, vision; Group Code: commitment; vision; Final Group Code: role modeling, transparent communication). So, I was really excited by the direction the University was heading. And, I love the fact that he dreamed these really big audacious dreams (Code 1: dreaming; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication). And, he was quite a sales...is...it's not like he's dead. He just retired. He is quite a salesman and convinced me that this University has got a great future and that we need good people to help move it forward (Code 1: persuasion; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). So, certainly it affected my level of commitment (Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling) to him just sort of right out of the gate...his tireless commitment to the mission helped drive me (Code 1: leader commitment, vision; Group Code: commitment, vision; Final Group Code: role modeling, transparent communication). You know that he just, you know, he's just sort of a bulldog. You just keep going and you keep going and you get knocked down and you get back up again and you just, there's little roadblocks that are in the way (Code 1: persistence; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling). You know, in some ways, one of the funniest things he ever said to me after my first year when we did my performance review. He said one of the things I like about you is people just throw shit at your feet and you step over it and just keep going forward. And, it was in some ways it's fantastic because that's him too. That it's, you know, department of Ed fine. OK. Move on. Yeah and HUD fine. OK. Move on. Oh what's this the HLC's not going to let us do engineering this year. OK. Move on. And, you just keep moving on. And, in some ways it's really refreshing to see your leader not get bogged down and bummed out for a long time over these headaches (Code 1: persistence; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling). You know, that...that really helped me a lot in terms of getting through those times when inevitably an organization you're thinking why are we doing this (Code 1: persistence; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling). So, that was one of the things that, you know, that really helped me get through those challenging times.

The most prevalent theme emerged as transparent communication (40), including the group codes of transparency (23), vision (11), and democratic (14). The group code transparency included the following initial codes: clear communication (12), openness (6), listen (5), tolerant (2), shared information (2), persuasion (1), synthesized information (1), and sounding board (1). The group code vision included the following initial codes: vision (10) and dreaming (1). The group code democratic included the following initial codes: participative (10), not authoritative (3), and team (1). The literature argued for increased follower commitment as a result of clearly articulated goals and vision that results from participation in the visioning process (Bass, 2000; House, 1976; Shamir, et al., 1993). The data supported the concepts of a participatory and transparent visioning process.

The second most prevalent theme emerged as quality relationships (26), including the group codes of democratic (14), authentic (6), affirmation (4), building relationships (3), and integrity (2). The group code democratic included the following initial codes: participative (10), not authoritative (3), and team (1). The group code of authentic included the following initial codes: respect (2), vulnerable (1), genuine (1), and humility (1). The group code of affirmation included the following initial codes: had my back (2), guidance (1), and trusted me (1). The group code of building relationships included the following initial codes: personable (3). Finally, the group code of integrity included the following initial codes: trust (1) and integrity (1). Again, the quality of the relationship between the leader and follower provided a foundational piece of the commitment to the leader's vision and goals. In some ways, the quality of the relationship between the leader and follower provided a foundational place from which transparent communication could arise.

Two smaller themes emerged from the data, including role modeling (11) and self-efficacy (5). Role modeling included the group code of commitment (11), which included the following initial codes: leader commitment (4), persistence (3), bought in (3), and loyalty (1). Self-efficacy included the group codes of autonomy (5) and affirmation (2). Autonomy included the initial codes of autonomy (1), freedom (1), and let others lead (1). Affirmation included the initial codes of trusted me (1) and guidance (1). Again, participants indicated that the commitment shown by the leader provided both an example to emulate and a place from which their own personal autonomy in meeting the vision of the organization could arise (House, 1976).

### **Questions 3: In what ways does your leader mentor and empower you in your role?**

Overall, participants indicated that their leader mentored and empowered them through a quality relationship. Several participants readily termed their interaction as mentorship, but just as many indicated that they did not feel it was a mentoring relationship. The salience of affirmation in supporting both the quality of their

relationship and their sense of self-efficacy surfaces as a key component in follower perceptions of mentoring and empowerment.

*Greg:* Um, well, I mean I would say he surely did, just to begin with. Boy, just off the top of my head to come up with specific instances isn't necessarily as easy. You know Brad first of all was just an encouraging person (*Code 1: encouraged; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*)...Brad was very unhappy, that he hadn't been at the meeting and he, it was very clear. He made it very clear to me that he was unhappy about that (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). And, I felt just terrible. And he could tell I felt pretty bad. So, I walked out of there. Later on, he came into my office and it was just the most interesting thing because he had worked out in his own mind why it is that I would not have invited him to that meeting. He basically sat down and explained this to me (*Code 1: had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). It, you know, it was just the craziest thing because it was clear that Brad wanted to kind of justify to me, you know, why it was, because he knew I was feeling bad (*Code 1: had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). And even though when I got into his office he was unhappy, he didn't want me to feel bad about it (*Code 1: positive feedback; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). So, I think the situation with mentoring was for Brad. Brad just encouraged the people who worked for him (*Code 1: encouraged; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). He wanted to them to they were valuable that their opinions were valuable and that he always was on their side (*Code 1: listen, had my back; Group Code: transparency, affirmation; Final Group Code: transparent communication, self-efficacy*). I guess, is what I would say. That he sort of had their backs (*Code 1: had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). He wasn't the kind of boss who was looking to bring you up short and to give you a difficult time if you didn't do one thing or another but he always wanted to encourage you and emphasize your strengths (*Code 1: encouraged; validated; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). You know, and the other side of mentoring that has to do more with teaching you things, ah, I have no doubt that I learned a lot from Brad (*Code 1: teaching; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). And, I think probably the thing I learned more from Brad than anything else would be about how to interact with other people when you're trying to set forth goals...And, I think from Brad, you know, he taught me a different kind of approach to things that had to do with interacting more with other people as you try to forge some kind of plan (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). And, I think that was helpful as well.

*Kara:* I did think of him as a mentor, even from the beginning. I had my interview...and he happened to be here in his office in his sweatpants and a sweatshirt sitting at the table (*Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And, you know they were like go see Brad for a little while. So, I went and visited with him and from that initial conversation, honestly I still remember it felt like that was a moment where I just thought this man is wise and he has a lot of information to share and we have a common interest in theatre, particularly, that we really talked about a lot (*Code 1: common ground; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). Mentoring to me isn't just about what your job is right now. It's about where you are going and where you have been (*Code 1: encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). Right now, where are you going and where are you going to. And my feeling is, has been really helpful in those areas. Let me see, visiting with him I guess you make me feel empower me? I can't say never. I can't say never, I shouldn't say because I don't know how he treated everybody else. I imagine he has similar experiences. Brad is very consistent (*Code 1: consistent; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I think he empowered me in always feeling like I can do whatever I want (*Code 1: empowered, affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You know I mean you put your mind to it and just decide that you're going to do something if (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). When I hearing what the goal is for the campaign initially around the 60 million. I knew I wasn't doing it alone (*Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*), depending on what the donors do when they have a great committee and the [New President] are, they guide it, they both were instrumental in letting me lead you know and sometimes you have to be let to lead the university (*Code 1: guidance; let others lead; Group Code: autonomy, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). One thing that I found, it's not always that every individual gets to lead...Whatever your strengths are you going to lead, to lead a big project like that. I thought that was, they really had faith in me (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I certainly would never want to let Brad or the [NEW PRESIDENT] down in that regard or myself. But I do feel like he empowered me in a lot of different ways (*Code 1: empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

*Ray:* I think he had a certain level of trust in me as well from our interactions and the fact that he would let me run with certain kinds of projects (*Code 1: trusted; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). For instance...when I came I sat down in his office...I remember that day and I said here, here's what I think about if I can continue with this, with this project of

yours. I said, I feel that it has to be this kind of a thing because other entities in town are doing these other kinds of things and I, I, didn't get any pushback from him about, well no, you know, you'd be the director but what I really need you to look at is this. He simply said, go ahead with it and let's, let's, see if it works (Code 1: *trusted me; autonomy; Group Code: affirmation, autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I'll support that. And, he was...he was both financially supportive and, I think, professionally supportive of the job he did for that. I feel that he was professionally supportive of me in my capacity as a faculty member in that as often as he could he came to...(Code 1: *support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). But, but, more than just for me. He was incredibly supportive of my department... (Code 1: *support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*)...And, yes, that did empower me. I feel as though in my own job as chair... Absolutely (Code 1: *empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

**Mark:** I would say. I didn't have mentoring experience with him but I think indirectly I was empowered because all of those positive remarks he made about what I have done for the students and community at large was very empowering for me. (Code 1: *affirmation, empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*) Because when the president of the university stops and tells me that I have done something good for the students' education or placement or companies have contacted him and they have said that our students project really has helped the company those positive remarks indirectly empowered me that I'm doing something darn good that the president will bring it up to my attention. (Code 1: *positive feedback, empowered, gave attention; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

**Sam:** He definitely empowered me in the sense that he would listen to my counsel (Code 1: *empowered, listen, trusted me; Group Code: affirmation, transparency; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationship, transparent communication*), which I'm kind of repeating myself. But I think that's absolutely true...And he would always listen to my thoughts on what we should do and that was and would back me up and so it was very empowering (Code 1: *listen, trusted me, had my back, empowered; Group Code: transparency, affirmation; Final Group Code: transparent communication, self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And, at the same time you have that respect for him that you knew, you still knew who was in charge (Code 1: *respect, responsible; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). That sounds strange I guess but you would never take advantage of that because of who he is you would never overstep your bounds. I never, no I was always made sure not to overstep my bounds, because sometimes because he is so laidback and so personable (Code 1: *laidback, personable; Group Code: building relationships, authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*), that again

sometimes you kind of forget he was the President sometimes, but because you respect him because he does empower you (Code 1: *respect, empowered*; Group Code: *authenticity, affirmation*; Final Group Codes: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You know, you know, you kind of know how far you can go...out of respect for him that he would mean he would let you say your piece and your argument (Code 1: *respect, tolerant, openness*; Group Code: *authenticity, transparency*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, transparent communication*). It was very empowering and which was much different than the experience I had in my previous job (Code 1: *empowered*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

Paula: I had to learn from what Brad didn't say (Code 1: *autonomy*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*). Not from what he said. So, for example, Brad believed in people and sometimes you would get frustrated because you knew that there were times when people were struggling more than they should (Code 1: *had my back*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, self-efficacy*). And, what are we going to do about that. And, he believes so much in people that he wouldn't let you discuss it...And, the question would always become are they going to be better in another role (Code 1: *encouraged growth*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). Maybe we should move them to here. Well, there was a lot of learning lessons in that because now that I am in this role you realize you have nothing but your people (Code 1: *building relationships*; Group Code: *building relationships*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). You cannot get anything done if people don't buy in (Code 1: *building relationships*; Group Code: *building relationships*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). And if they don't want to work for you. That's why he had to have been so supportive of his people for so long (Code 1: *support*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*)...Yes. Brad, you know this is your...this is your lane now. Take it. And he just sometimes didn't (Code 1: *autonomy*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*).

Mary: So, at times they would actually go in and talk with Dr. Bradley and we would go through what was going on...very liberating, he never micromanaged at least not with me (Code 1: *not micromanager, autonomy*; Group Code: *democratic, autonomy*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication, quality relationships, self-efficacy*). I always felt like I was affirmed (Code 1: *affirmation*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And, given a lot of room to go in directions that I thought were helpful (Code 1: *guidance*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). So, I always felt empowered by talking with him and he was always very respectful, very affirming, encouraging (Code 1: *empowered, affirmation*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, self-efficacy*). I just really have positive

things to say (Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy). My experience with him was really always good.

*Tammy:* Well, I think definitely through the various promotions (Code 1: encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy).

*Pete:* Well having the public support, both in term of large group settings, was always appreciated, but also in individual settings, whether it was just me and him or whether it was me or, you know, and two or three other people in the room (Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). He was always really supportive (Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships)...That sort of support was really, really, valuable to me (Code 1: support, had my back; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). And, then, we also did have a few moments where it usually wasn't during performance or any of the formal stuff, but it was after, you know, I sat down in his office and both of us would have our head in a hand talking about an issue and he would just, just the basic acknowledgment of...you have had to deal with a lot of crap and you've dealt with it well (Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). Those sorts of little acknowledgments went a long way (Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships)...He was empathetic (Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). He was empathetic and what he was so good about those moments was he wouldn't, he didn't leave it to like...oh yeah, the academic dean has to deal with a lot of crap (Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). I had to deal with when I was a dean and you got deal with it now. But, it was...you know what, I've dealt with tough faculty and I know what you're going through. And you know some of them are jerks. It's just all there is to it. And, ah, you'll be all right. You just have to fight through it and you'll be OK (Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). In some ways there's, and I've recognized it...When I get together with other academic Deans you don't even have to talk about the details and all of that kind of stuff that come along with the position. There is this understanding of peer to peer, I know you're dealing with garbage right now and you know that I'm dealing with garbage right now. And, there is just that acknowledgement that he made that you know I've been there too (Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). I got through it and I know you need my support and I'm going to support you (Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). And, you know, we're on the same team and we'll get through this (Code 1: togetherness; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships).

The most prevalent theme emerged as quality relationships (53), including group codes of affirmation (44), building relationships (6), authenticity (4), integrity (2), and democratic (1). The group code of affirmation includes the following initial codes: empowered (10), support (8), had my back (7), affirmation (6), empathy (6), trusted me (5), encouraged growth (3), encouraged (3), positive feedback (2), guidance (2), gave attention (1), and validated (1). The group code of building relationships included the following initial codes: building relationships (2), personable (2), common ground (1), and togetherness (1). The group code of authenticity included the following initial codes: respect (3) and laidback (1). The group code of integrity included the following initial codes: responsible (1) and consistent (1). Finally, the group code of democratic included the initial code of not a micromanager (1). The data supported the concept of psychological empowerment (van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012). In particular, while participants articulated concepts such as empowerment and mentoring, the data suggest moving beyond empowerment alone to affirmation, which moves from merely giving the power and authority for a follower to do something, to providing the emotional support and encouragement needed to meet challenges.

The second prevalent theme emerged as self-efficacy (47), including group codes of affirmation (40) and autonomy (5). The group code of affirmation includes the following initial codes: empowered (10), support (8), had my back (7), affirmation (6), empathy (6), trusted me (5), encouraged growth (3), encouraged (3), positive feedback (2), guidance (2), gave attention (1), and validated (1). The group code of autonomy included the initial codes of autonomy (4) and let others lead (1). Again, quality relationships and self-efficacy emerged from the data in relation to each other. The quality of the relationship between the leader and follower directly influenced the follower's perception of empowerment. If a follower perceived that the leader believed in and trusted them and recognized the leader's affirming behavior, they felt empowered to meet tasks and challenges.

The remaining two final group codes emerged as transparent communication (6) and role modeling (2). Transparent communication included the group codes of transparency (6) and democratic (1). Transparency included the following initial codes: listen (3), clear communication (1), openness (1), and tolerant (1). Democratic included one initial code, not a micromanager (1). Role modeling included the group code of role model (2), which included initial codes of role model (1) and teaching (1). Again, transparency emerged as a supporting theme for follower empowerment. The leader's willingness to listen and openness to conversation provided an avenue by which follower's confirmed the affirmation they experienced from the leader. Finally, the leader's ability to act as a role model and engage in teaching provided additional support for follower's perceptions of being empowered.



**Question 4: Has that mentorship or empowerment created or supported personal self-efficacy for you in the forms of meaningful work, autonomy, confidence, and knowing the impact of your work?**

Overall, participants described self-efficacy as a result of a quality relationship with the leader and affirming leader behaviors. Participants felt affirmed as a result of the leader's praise and affirmation, trust in them, validation, and guidance. The quality relationship included affirming behaviors, democratic processes, and an overall faith in the leader's authenticity and integrity.

*Greg:* Well, with respect to the meaning of the work, I think, the one thing that Brad was really good at was affirming people (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You know encouragement is one thing, and Brad was very encouraging, but he was also was affirming of people (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And, I think when a person is affirmed in what they are doing, I think that adds to the sense that their work is meaningful (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation*). Brad was just very, very affirming (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You know, he would be affirming publicly and by publicly it would be like in a cabinet meeting Brad would thank someone for the contribution that they had made in a particular process or a particular idea or report that had been given or work in at accreditation you know, visit or something like that...(*Code 1: affirmation, praise; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*)...You know, he was very free with his compliments (*Code 1: praise; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You know, it's interesting that, you know, Brad brought back previous people...and others who had been before him to honor them. Lots of people are you know not willing to do that because they're kind of threatened by previous successful people who hold their position or were well liked in the community (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity; authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And Brad wasn't like that because Brad was just affirming in general (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And so, you know, when he was willing to affirm people not only privately what she did but publicly that really gave you a sense that what you did for the community was meaningful and important (*Code 1: affirmation, praise; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And, I think that was one of the primary ways that he helped people to, to, to, believe that their work was meaningful...there was something else you said besides meaning, what was the other word that you just used...Oh, yeah self-confidence...You know, you take, you step into a new position, and you always feel a little bit uncertain about how your abilities are going to fit with

that and, again Brad's willingness to so affirming and supportive (*Code 1: affirmation, support, empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And that's not to say that Brad didn't ever say that you did something wrong. He did. Or that, I wish you would do more of this or more of that. I mean Brad, you know, he could also make those kinds of statements, though he would always be kind of soft in that. But his tendency to be affirming, ah really helped one to gain self-confidence because whenever one takes on a new position there's always just a little lack of confidence and the constant affirmation that Brad had and his willingness to affirm, I think really encouraged one's confidence as one tried to get one's feet on the ground in a new position (*Code 1: affirmation, positive feedback, encouraged; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

*Kara:* I do think at least the way that to me ways that he mentored and empowered me at least in ways that it created meaning in my work to me was that it allowed me to just know that I could dream bigger and not just dream bigger...to follow through on the work (*Code 1: dreaming; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). To me it's important to come to work every day with the knowledge that what you do is important in some way to someone besides yourself and you know if it's all about you...it's not very meaningful in my opinion (*Code 1: validated; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). So, I do think Brad did help me feel like any time I'm going to work that I cannot do what I want. But that it was important that I guess that helps me think that there is meaning in it (*Code 1: validated; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). As far as autonomy again he was and is always supportive (*Code 1: autonomy, support; Group Code: autonomy, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I don't feel like he ever had a thumb on me in any way. I always felt like any conversation I had with him was positive which is not something you can say about every leader (*Code 1: positive feedback; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I never felt like he was trying to. Even if he didn't agree with something or if he thought that might not be the direction we needed to go, I always felt like it was a very nurturing conversation and it always made me feel like, he always made me feel like in the end that it was my decision, but I need to take X Y and Z factors into consideration (*Code 1: tolerant, trusted me; Group Code: transparency, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*). And there's...I mean, I feel like again in our department that there's a lot of autonomy that happens in a teamwork environment, interesting that I feel like that comes from the top down (*Code 1: team, autonomy; Group Code: democratic, autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*). So as far as did he make me feel more self-confident?...Yeah that's an interesting question because like I

said when I first heard what the goal was for the campaign, I keep going back to the central focus of my work. I never felt like I couldn't do it and it was because I knew that I had his support and confidence, which helped my confidence and the same for both of them (*Code 1: support, trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

*Ray:* I'm not sure whether it was anything that he did deliberately or if it was just his style. As part of the academic arm of the university, I never felt that he micromanaged anybody really (*Code 1: not micromanager; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships*). I mean, I certainly, he never micromanaged my department about the direction we should take, should be taking any direction (*Code 1: not micromanager; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships*)...because I do feel that, I do feel very autonomous in my role (*Code 1: autonomy; Group Code: autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy*). I feel that I can't do anything I want. But I probably could for a while...I always I, I, think I always try to act in best interests of university. And, I think I had a good role model in Brad, I guess (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...Everybody who is working here wants to be here, administratively...So, we're just lucky we get those really, really, good role models (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). That doesn't mean they don't make bad decisions from time to time. And, it also doesn't mean that I, I, simply that I'm sycophantic that I just you know. Oh, yes, Brad made that decision. I absolutely agree with that. No, I, you know, I question lots of stuff that they do. And, I think that they, they, Brad, in particular, was, was, very comfortable with people offering insight, bordering on criticism, input i. As I said I didn't work with him that closely on many things but the things I did, he always seemed to be open to those things (*Code 1: openness; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). And, I think, that that is, is, you know that unconsciously if nothing else served as a really, really, good role model for what I do in my job (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). I hope.

*Mark:* I think it is very important. I thought...it does matter if the leader of an institution or an organization recognizes the contribution of an employee regardless of the status they have (*Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

*Sam:* Absolutely. Trust and trust is a big word (*Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He trusted my opinion (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). He trusted what I was doing (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). That didn't mean I could just go do whatever I

wanted to do. Obviously, I would go meet with him and talk about what my plans were and he would also trust me with *projects* (Code 1: *listen, openness*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). And... he didn't tell me the 10 things I needed to do (Code 1: *autonomy*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*). He told me I think we need to think about making that step (Code 1: *guidance: affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You need to go out and find out what it's going to take and that's all (Code 1: *trusted me*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). That helps me... And he really respected that and never second-guessed me, which is nice because we make mistakes (Code 1: *respect, trusted me*; Group Code: *authenticity, affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). Everybody makes mistakes. You know Brad is not the kind of person to go and hold it against you or you made this mistake (Code 1: *understanding*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*), so we're not going to do this... So I try to take those lessons I've learned from him and use that with our staff in their department and try to empower [people] as much as possible and listen to them as much as possible (Code 1: *role model*; Group code: *role model*; Final Group Code: *role modeling*).

*Paula:* Yeah, for sure, for sure. I...making decisions is like exercise. The more you make them the easier it is to make them and the quicker probably that you learn it's OK to make them... And because of the kind of leader that he was he wasn't going to make that decision for you (Code 1: *autonomy*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*). He gave you the right to make that decision (Code 1: *autonomy*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*). He also somehow earned our...our respect enough that we knew and our understanding maybe enough that we knew when (Code 1: *trusted me, respect*; Group Code: *affirmation, authenticity*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). If I'm going to make it I need to let him know (Code 1: *respect*; Group Code: *authenticity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). And when I didn't need to let them know he let you lead (Code 1: *let others lead*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*). But, if they ever were going to affect something that he would have to answer to I made sure he knew and he had a real gift for that. He had a very nice way of ensuring you his trust (Code 1: *trust, trusted me*; Group Code: *integrity, affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You can make that decision on your own (Code 1: *autonomy*; Group Code: *autonomy*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy*).

*Mary:* I would definitely say yes. His generosity and evenhandedness, the way that he allowed for people to move forward in what they were doing (Code 1: *evenhandedness, generosity, autonomy*; Group Code: *integrity, service, autonomy*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships, self-efficacy, role modeling*). I always took my position...as a calling and I felt that that was affirmed by Brad (Code 1:

*affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*)...But he didn't just say start a committee and let's and leave it at that, he remained very connected to that program and really in some ways the students themselves would look to him as an example of the things (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*) we talked about in class and he would come in to our class and talk about leadership (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)... So, there was a very tight involvement at least in my program (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*), so I felt extremely empowered to move in the direction of you know leadership the vision that we saw at that time which was servant leadership and he became familiar with that (*Code 1: empowered, vision; Group Code: affirmation, vision; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*).

*Tammy:* Well, I think he really was somewhat of a hands-off leader (*Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). Once he made you responsible for something you felt that responsibility (*Code 1: empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). He also was pretty quick with praise (*Code 1: praise; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You knew what he liked and on the flip side maybe what he didn't. I think that environment gave me confidence...He made you feel like you were hired because you're capable and go forth (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

*Pete:* I would say so. Mostly because he's just not a micromanager at all (*Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). Once I figured out that he's not going to tell me you need to do this, oh you need to do that. But instead I do this and then he says okay I get back or he says are you sure you want to do that. And he will kind of talk me through some issues and then I felt I felt very empowered to do the job and how I need to do it (*Code 1: empowered, guidance; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I don't know if it helped me find additional meaning in the job. I think the meaning comes from the vision so to the extent that he was able to articulate a vision for what the University ought to be, it helped me find meaning (*Code 1: vision; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). But that's where I find the meaning in the work. And, it's broad, broader than just us as a University. It's sort of the higher ed, on a larger scale, sort of meaning is where I find a lot of the meaning.

*Elaine:* Yeah, he was good at expressing appreciation about encouraging finding solutions, if we had a hiccup or something (*Code 1: empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). How to make

something go better and a way for me to learn moving forward how to be more effective in my role (*Code 1: encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

The most prevalent theme emerged as self-efficacy (40), with group codes of affirmation (33) and autonomy (8). Affirmation included the initial codes: affirmation (10), trusted me (7), empowered (5), praise (4), support (3), guidance (2), validated (2), positive feedback (2), encouraged growth (10), understanding (1), and encouraged (1). Autonomy included the initial codes: autonomy (7) and let others lead (1). van Dierendonck and Dijkstra (2012) argued that self-efficacy is directly influenced by leader empowering behavior. The data indicated support for this argument with the salience of affirming and empowering behaviors.

The second prevalent theme emerged as quality relationships (33), with group codes of affirmation (33), democratic (5), authenticity (4), and integrity (3). The group code of affirmation includes the following initial codes: affirmation (10), trusted me (7), empowered (5), praise (4), support (3), guidance (2), validated (2), positive feedback (2), encouraged growth (10), understanding (1), and encouraged (1). The group code of democratic included the following initial codes: not authoritative (2), not micromanager (2), and team (1). The group code of authenticity included the following initial codes: respect (3) and humility (1). The group code of integrity including the initial codes of trust (2) and evenhandedness (1). Winston (2003) argued that self-efficacy is influenced by social environment and Poon (2006) indicated that the relationship between the servant leader and follower has a positive impact on both leader and follower self-efficacy. The data supported the conclusion that the quality of the relationship between a leader and follower directly impacts follower self-efficacy.

Transparent communication (11) included group codes of democratic (5), vision (3), and transparency (1). Democratic included the initial codes: not authoritative (2), not micromanager (2), and team (1). Vision included the initial codes: vision (2) and dreaming (1). Transparency included one initial code, transparency (1). Role modeling (7) included the group codes of role model (4), commitment (2), and service (1). Role modeling included the initial code role model (4). Commitment included the initial code leader commitment (2). Finally, service included the initial code generosity (1). Both transparent communication and role modeling supported the overall self-efficacy of followers. In particular, transparent communication and role modeling behaviors that engaged in democratic processes and showed leader commitment to the organization and organizational members supported follower self-efficacy.

### Question 5: How has your leader encouraged or supported your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks?

Overall, participants indicated their intrinsic motivation was encouraged and supported by a quality relationship of mutual trust and affirmation that allowed for autonomy. Furthermore, transparent communication that included active listening and openness provided additional support for their intrinsic motivation and the quality relationship with the leader. Finally, the leader's own commitment and service to the organization and organizational members increased personal intrinsic motivation to meet challenges.

*Greg:* I want to say yes to everything, as you know because I just thought Brad was a great leader. I really do. Not that he didn't have any weaknesses, but he did a wonderful job for my kind of personality. Well, I guess I would say without thinking about it too long, that, you know I tend to be a person who is intrinsically motivated, to begin with, and if I understand it properly because my nature is that way. I'm an introvert. I tend to act out of a kind of internal goals and want to do the things I enjoy doing and that I feel I'm good at, and, ah I think, you know, in a situation, if I were to compare Brad to a different kind of leader, you know, when the last president was there, for example, and I wasn't working as dean, but had I been working in that kind of situation, with somebody who basically would just give me an order, tell me to do something with it, whether they thought it was something that I was good at, wanted to do, liked, had any part in deciding or *anything* (Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication)...I think the fact that Brad was so encouraging of people trying to be part of this decision making process and each one to use the skills and particular talents they have to contribute to the shared ownership and that really did encourage people to operate from what were their internal motivations (Code 1: encouraged; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships)...So, I never felt, you know...I think that Brad made a lot of room because of his nature for people to do the things that they wanted to do and to play their strengths and because of that I think I was able to do things that encouraged the kind of operation out that internal motivation (Code 1: autonomy, let others lead; Group Code: autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy).

*Kara:* OK, so you think...again Brad was always very positive in all conversations (Code 1: positive feedback; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). He was never belittling or demeaning anyone anyway (Code 1: affirmation; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). So, who doesn't want to work for a person who is so kind-hearted and yet has a lot of quote "power" of the University (Code 1: care; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling). But if you just met him on the street you

would never know that that's who he is you he seems like just an ordinary person (Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships). He's not like way up on some kind of pedestal (Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships). He doesn't think of himself in that way and he doesn't project that image (Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships). So to me that's motivating because I like to work with people who are down to earth (Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships) who are very goal oriented and aware of have their own ideas of what's important for the organization (Code 1: vision; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication), but are willing to listen (Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency) and are willing to always willing to learn from other people (Code 1: humility; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships). So, to me, it's like all of these factors together always make me feel like I was encouraged and I was always supported (Code 1: encouraged, supported; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). In the different jobs that I held in my life, it's so weird but it's true. I always think of life when I wake up in the morning excited to be going where I'm going...because you knew that you're going somewhere positive where you'd be reinforced in what you do (Code 1: positive feedback; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). You'd have something to listen to be a sounding board which is interesting because someone who is in charge are not, they're not always interested in being a sounding board (Code 1: listen, sounding board; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication).

Ray: Before, you know, when we sat down to talk about them before we ever posted and I never felt that he had directed me to do anything that I probably wasn't going to do already (Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships)...He had a pretty good understanding of what we needed here and gave me that input that allowed me to do those tasks (Code 1: let others lead, autonomy; Group Code: autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy) more easily knowing that, knowing that the person that we were going to recommend would be somebody that he was going to be likely to hire...I do believe that I have the kind of relationship with him that I could have said no (Code 1: tolerant; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). You know, I, why do you want that. I think we could have had an open dialogue (Code 1: transparency; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication)...Well, OK. We had those kinds of frank discussions about several artists over the years (Code 1: openness; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication).



**Mark:** We did some projects...he did have the time and he came and listened (*Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*) to the presentation with Tammy at that time and took notes and he wanted to have a copy of that...my contact with him was basically when we met when we saw each other and sometimes short conversation but those conversations and contacts were very, very, important because he was filled with positive remarks (*Code 1: positive feedback; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). It was filled with encouragement and also it was with the fact that the university has challenges but he made it very simple that he can ride through the turmoil (*Code 1: affirmation, clear communication; Group Code: affirmation, transparency; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*)...Absolutely. Brad always respected me...(Code 1: respect; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships)...I think it's very, very, important that that recognition that they trusted me that my judgment can play a vital role (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). That was a great motivation. And, that's called empowerment, I would say (*Code 1: empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*).

**Sam:** I think so...he trusted me with that process and that that motivates you that (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*)... I'm pretty motivated. Nobody really needs to motivate me. But we all have internal motivations. You know it's easier to be motivated when you feel good about where you are and who you're working for. And so he let me dive headlong into that and let me have those conversations and he trusted that I would do the right thing (*Code 1: autonomy, trusted me; Group Code: autonomy, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). Trusting my abilities (*Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*) and that makes a big difference, I don't care who you are. You know that's going to make, you know that's going to help your motivation no matter how motivated you are that's going to give you that extra boost to know that you know he trusts you and he believes in your leadership (*Code 1: trusted me, let others lead; Group Code: affirmation, autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And I think it also reflects...Brad's an interesting person because he's so laid back and personable (*Code 1: laid back, personable; Group Code: authenticity, building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*), you know, people sometimes mistake those qualities for thinking there's something else behind it. And the other thing behind it for me was humility (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity, authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And when you're the President of an academic institution, humility and college presidents usually do not go hand in hand. Not just humility, self-humility, humility, humility, in the sense that he was not

threatened by other people (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity, authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

*Paula:* I was born with that...So, I want this university to be the best it can be. I wanted the people I worked with to be the best they could be and I wanted Brad's leadership to be the best it could be (*Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And, if there was any way I could help them be the best leader here that...that he could ever be I was going to give everything I had (*Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*). I've thought about that over and over and over again. Why?...Had it been a different leader who was a...who is more dominating in their personality, who is maybe more direct who is maybe more bossy, I would have maybe not felt that same (*Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships*)...I did feel like he needed me (*Code 1: felt needed; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). And so I had to. You know, maybe that maybe that was a gift of his.

*Mary:* Again, I think just allowing me autonomy (*Code 1: autonomy; Group Code: autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy*). I felt like I had a lot of um, I was able to lead within my own circle (*Code 1: autonomy; Group Code: autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy*). To move the students in a direction that we, that the program really needed to go. So, I felt like that was, there was a lot of freedom there (*Code 1: freedom; Group Code: autonomy; Final Group Code: self-efficacy*). He, I would say that Dr. Bradley, was aware (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*) that there was always an awareness of what was going on which was important to me, that the program was noticed because, you don't want to feel like you're out there alone (*Code 1: support; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I felt like he had, he was able to listen (*Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*) when that was appropriate and was aware (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*).

*Tammy:* As you know there is so much work to be done here and such limited resources. Um, that I think it just personally gave me the feeling that you have to step up to the plate, step up to the plate and you have to give all you have because it's a worthy goal (*Code 1: vision; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). We have a worthy mission...Well, I think because he embraced the mission and was so committed to it, um, it was it easy to support that (*Code 1: leader commitment, vision; Group Code: Commitment, Vision; Final Group Code: role modeling, transparent communication*).

*Pete:* I think it's more like, he's probably done more through having a sense of empathy with me knowing what I'm going through (*Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). We never had really explicit conversations about that... Yeah, yeah, that's right, exactly! It was sort of assumed more than anything else. But, not the sense of empathy that he had, that's like okay, somebody else knows what I'm going through (*Code 1: empathy; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). Other people have gone through this. I'm not crazy for wanting to do this. You know those sorts of things.

*Elaine:* Yeah, he was very encouraging (*Code 1: support; empowered; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships*). He was very encouraging and just observing him and his work ethic and his motivation to reach out to find common ground with others (*Code 1: support, role model; Group Code: affirmation, role model; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, role modeling*). That's a motivator for me, to emulate that (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). And I'm probably not as good at that, yet as he has been. It's good to have a reminder of what are some examples of what he has done in the past, that I can recall (*Code 1: role model; Group code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*).

The most prevalent theme emerged as quality relationships (32), which included group codes of affirmation (14), building relationships (5), authenticity (5), and democratic (3). The group code affirmation included the following initial codes: trusted me (4), support (3), positive feedback (3), empowered (2), affirmation (2), encouraged (2), empathy (2), and felt needed (1). The group code building relationships included one initial code, personable (5). The group code authenticity included the following initial codes: humility (5), laid back (1), and respect (1). The group code democratic included one initial code, not authoritative (2). The data supported the concept of consideration shown by the leader impacting overall follower motivation, in the themes of affirmation and building relationships (Harrell, 2008). In addition, the data supported the concept of participatory decision making and developmental activities increasing intrinsic motivation in the themes of democratic (Tu & Lin, 2016).

The second prevalent theme emerged as self-efficacy (24), which included group codes of affirmation (14) and autonomy (7). The group code affirmation included the following initial codes: trusted me (4), support (3), positive feedback (3), empowered (2), affirmation (2), encouraged (2), empathy (2), and felt needed (1). The group code of autonomy included the following initial codes: autonomy (5), let others lead (3), and freedom (1). Again, the data supported the concept of leader consideration (Harrell, 2008). However, the data also indicated a strong theme of autonomy and freedom associated with intrinsic motivation. In many cases, participants indicated that they

possessed natural intrinsic motivation, but that the leader's willingness to let them engage that motivation on their own terms increased their overall intrinsic motivation.

Transparent communication (14) included group codes transparency (8), vision (3), and democratic (3). Transparency included the following initial codes: listen (4), transparency (1), openness (1), tolerant (1), and sounding board (1). Vision included one initial code, vision (3). Democratic included one initial code, not authoritative (3). Role modeling (8) included group codes commitment (4), role model (3), and service (1). Commitment included initial codes leader commitment (3) and loyalty (1). Role model included one initial code, role model (3). Service included one initial code, care (1). Again, the commitment the leader expressed both toward the organization and the organizational members, coupled with transparent communication supported by active listening and tolerance to opposing ideas, further supported individual follower's sense of intrinsic motivation.

### **Question 6: What factors of the relationship between you and your leader have most supported your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks?**

Overall, participants indicated that the quality of their relationship with the leader was the greatest factor in supporting their intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks. In particular, the leader had taken the time to build a relationship based on the leader's affirmation of the follower, integrity, which resulted in mutual trust, and an overall expression of evenhandedness in dealing with challenging situations.

Transparent communication supported the quality relationship, particularly in the form of active listening. Finally, the leader's modeled commitment to the organization and organizational members increased their overall trust and willingness to engage challenging tasks and goals.

*Gary:* Well, first, since you just said that, I will echo that I surely did trust Brad (*Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I did feel that Brad was trustworthy (*Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). If I needed to say something to him, to reveal something to him, if there was something that I didn't do or felt I didn't know how to do...With Brad, I wouldn't have any problem. In fact, on various occasions I could sit down in his office and say, you know, Brad I'm not quite sure how to go about this, I'm not quite sure what it is that would be my next step (*Code 1: guidance, tolerant, listen; Group Code: affirmation, transparency; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*). I never felt that if I revealed something that Brad would say, you know, you're an idiot or, you know, then why are you in this job. That wasn't Brad's approach. So, I think the fact that Brad was approachable surely encouraged that, that you could reveal not only your strengths but your weakness and Brad didn't take opportunity, wouldn't use that against you at another point in time (*Code 1: personable, had my*

*back, guidance; Group Code: building relationships, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships).* You know that was really helpful. I think that that encouraged a kind of internal self-motivation.

*Ray:* Yeah, I mean, I think that's what it would boil down to with me is the way I saw him do his job (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). The way I saw him interact with other members of his staff, though, once in a while time so I was privy to internal workings that I probably didn't really need to know about that, yet was, and I was able to glimpse into his thought processes on a on a couple of difficult situations, let's call them (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...As I said, you know, we, we both lead meetings with a certain amount of humor (*Code 1: sense of humor; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). As well, as well, I don't know how efficient he was in meetings...a meeting is also relationship building because the more you do that (*Code 1: relationships building; Group Code: relationship building; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). The better people work because they don't, they're not, accomplishing tasks at that point. They are working on a vision (*Code 1: vision; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). They're there, they're there and they're visioning strategy and they're strategizing vision. Let me just throw around buzzwords that is true. It's not just what we have this task. We need to have this three hour meeting get it done. No, it's...the relationships are created and I must say that the, the, other role models in my life were also servant leaders (*Code 1: building relationships; Group Code: role model, service, building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*). Certainly, more pleasant by far and far more meaningful...I don't know, why would I continue doing the performing arts series. Yeah, there is a need for it. Yeah, but, you know, I, I, believed in the mission that Brad took over from the town saying we really ought to have this (*Code 1: bought in; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*). And, I can't always say that I was happy...So, that was directly as a result of our relationship that we had (*Code 1: building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

*Mark:* I think. He was very down to earth individual (*Code 1: down to earth; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). That's one thing was very important because, again, I want to use this as I said earlier leaders that they take themselves serious... They're not leaders. He was a man he never took himself serious but he took his job serious (*Code 1: humility, leader commitment; Group Code: authenticity, commitment; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*)...He was very humble (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He was very easy to approach (*Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He was always willing to get to know you and your family (*Code 1:*

*building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships). And, I think that really adds up to that relationship (Code 1: building relationship; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships)...Brad is good listener (Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). He was very good listener (Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). He never attacked your ideas even if it might not be (Code 1: tolerant; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). And, he was sincere when he said I want to hear what you have to say (Code 1: authentic, listen; Group Code: authenticity, transparency; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication). And I think sometimes and I know some leaders...that I don't think they listen (Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). They pretend they are listening and you have to recognize (Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication)...But I do when I talk to them, I think they don't...they're not active listeners and I think Brad had an active listening skills which is very, very, important because you feel that you are being heard (Code 1: listen, gave attention; Group Code: transparency, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication). Somebody who listens so those are the things that I think made him unique (Code 1: listen; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication).*

*Sam: Trust (Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships) is big and I didn't, I didn't have that with my last boss. There was no there was not intrinsic, intrinsic trust factor there it wasn't. And, he's one of those people too that he might have. He didn't care who got the credit (Code 1: team; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: transparent communication, quality relationships). You know, you look at me a guy you know, he's the total opposite. And obviously, this is going to sound self-serving...he and I are a lot alike. I think in the sense that we know we like to banter back and forth and have fun (Code 1: sense of humor; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships) and, and I like working with people like that, you know. I mean there's a time for serious thought and preparation and there's a time to be a little less serious about things (Code 1: sense of humor; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships) and that, that motivates me, that empowers me, that gives you a self, self...It improves your own self-confidence knowing that he's paying attention what you're doing (Code 1: gave attention; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). There's no question, but it's not like if you make one little mistake it's, boy, it's going to be on your list or just don't know how to describe it really. I mean it's just a confidence knowing that he's going to treat you the right way (Code 1: trust, affirmation; Group Code: integrity, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). His leadership style*

that he's got he's got to do all the things, you talk to, is going to empower you, he's going to listen to you (Code 1: *listen, openness, empowered*; Group Code: *transparency, affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*). He's going to trust you (Code 1: *trust*; Group Code: *integrity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). At the end of the day the buck stops with him (Code 1: *responsible*; Group Code: *integrity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). We all knew that. But, you know, you could never say in my mind that he didn't listen to you (Code 1: *listen*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). And, then on the flip side you've got to be smart enough understand that you know you're going to be listened to but that doesn't mean everything is going to go your way (Code 1: *listen*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). Some people think when things don't go their way they're not listened to, which I find utterly hilarious, quite honestly. So, I mean when things don't go my way I think because of the way he did things, the way he listened, when things didn't go my way it never bothered me because I knew he listened (Code 1: *listen, respect*; Group Code: *transparency, integrity*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication, quality relationships*). I knew he thought about, he took me seriously, and so it's not like I expect every decision to go my way but it's never really bothered me (Code 1: *trusted me, understanding*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). I've never come back to my office and...you know and I just knew, you know he let me have my say and try to prove my point (Code 1: *tolerant, listen*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). And at the end of the day he said it was the best thing to do (Code 1: *trust*; Group Code: *integrity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*)...Yeah absolutely. Even on the side where he would call your, I don't know what, they call your bluff (Code 1: *direct*; Group Code: *transparency*; Final Group Code: *transparent communication*). That's not he wasn't afraid to tell you something was a bad idea but he did it in a way that didn't make you feel bad (Code 1: *direct, straightforward, guidance*; Group Code: *transparency, integrity, affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships, transparent communication*). So, he was really honest in a non-threatening way (Code 1: *honest*; Group Code: *integrity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). And you know if you walk into somebody's office and you saw an idea, I think it's a bad idea in cabinet they just kind of blow up on you, you're on your part of bringing more ideas. That person had a way, he never blew up (Code 1: *evenhanded*; Group Code: *integrity*; Final Group Code: *quality relationships*). You know that's a crazy idea. We're not going to do that. And, you, even though he was in his own tone if you didn't know you weren't sure were right where he was going. But you know I guess I never think that's the other thing, that it is not valued (Code 1: *validated*; Group Code: *affirmation*; Final Group Code: *self-efficacy, quality relationships*). You never felt bad if things didn't go your way. And that's,

that's a really important quality in a leader and that's something I probably do a better job frankly. So yeah I really enjoyed that.

*Paula:* Yes, I did trust him (Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships). I trusted him and I believed that he believed in his people (Code 1: trust, affirmation; Group Code: integrity, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). I always felt that way. He cared deeply about people so that mattered to me when I saw how much she cared about the people and how much he cared about our kids, our students (Code 1: care; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling). It mattered to me...I don't think Brad showed ego, that he never showed ego unless he needed to (Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships).

*Mary:* You know when I think about Dr. Bradley and when we talk about Dr. Bradley we were always say, oh we just love Dr. Bradley. I think just his character, his goodness (Code 1: character; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships). He was a person that could tear up when something when someone was harmed or we heard of a tragedy in our college community (Code 1: vulnerable, empathy; Group Code: authenticity, affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). He was just so genuine (Code 1: genuine; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships). Even at Christmastime when he would go in and read that Christmas story year and year there was something about his authenticity (Code 1: authenticity; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships) for me, at least, that made me very willing to work with him and feel...I guess I would say the factors just that authenticity that generosity of spirit, that empathy, you know his tender heartedness towards the community (Code 1: authenticity, generosity, empathy, vulnerable; Group Code: service, affirmation, authenticity; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships, role modeling). Very much concerned about the well-being of our community (Code 1: care; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling).

*Tammy:* I just felt, I felt that he felt I was confi...or capable and that just gave me all the more internal reasons to live up to those expectations (Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships). His belief in me gave me confidence and the will to do as much as I can (Code 1: trusted me; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships).

*Pete:* Oh yeah. In some ways I didn't want to let him down (Code 1: loyalty; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships).

*Elaine:* I always appreciated that he was an English major like me...finding something in common like that (Code 1: common ground; building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships). And working with



the board, he would give me, give me advice on how to work with them and interact with them (Code 1: support, guidance; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: self-efficacy, quality relationships).

The most prevalent theme emerged as quality relationships (43), which included group codes affirmation (15), integrity (15), building relationships (10), authentic (9), and democratic (1). Affirmation included the following initial codes: guidance (4), trusted me (3), gave attention (2), empathy (2), support (1), empowered (1), had my back (1), affirmation (1), understanding (1), and validated (1). Integrity included the following initial codes: trust (8), evenhanded (1), character (1), responsible (1), and straightforward (1). Building relationships included the following initial codes: building relationships (6), sense of humor (3), personable (2), and common ground (1). Authentic included the following initial codes: authenticity (3), humility (3), vulnerable (2), genuine (1), respect (1), and down to earth (1). Democratic included one initial code, team (1). Cho and Perry (2012) indicated that trustworthiness on the part of a leader directly impacts follower intrinsic motivation and Harrell (2008) argued that consideration for a follower by a leader impacts follower intrinsic motivation. The data supported both trustworthiness and consideration as factors influencing follower intrinsic motivation. Moreover, the data indicated that the leader's willingness to build relationships based on affirmation and mutual trust increased follower intrinsic motivation.

The second prevalent theme emerged as transparent communication (18), which included group codes transparency (16), democratic (1), and vision (1). Transparency included the following initial codes: listen (13), tolerant (2), openness (1), and direct (1). Democratic included one initial code, team (1). Vision included one initial code, vision (1). Berson, et al. (2015) argued that follower intrinsic motivation increases with participation in visioning and goal setting. The data indicated strongly that active listening both in a visioning and goal setting scenario and in a willingness to engage in empathetic understanding increased follower intrinsic motivation.

Self-efficacy (15) included the group code of affirmation (15). Affirmation included the following initial codes: guidance (4), trusted me (3), gave attention (2), empathy (2), support (1), empowered (1), had my back (1), affirmation (1), understanding (1), and validated (1). Role modeling (2) included the group codes role model (2) and commitment (2). Role model included one initial code, role model (2). Commitment included the following initial codes: leaders commitment (1), bought in (1), and loyalty (1). The data indicated that overall leader affirmation and leader commitment provided additional support for follower intrinsic motivation.

### Question 7: Are there specific leadership behaviors that influenced your intrinsic motivation to accomplish goals and tasks?

Overall, participants indicated that intrinsic motivation was influenced by leader behaviors supporting perceptions of integrity and authenticity, which included trust, honesty, and humility. Follower perceptions of integrity and authenticity stemmed from the quality relationships the leader had taken the time to cultivate. Finally, the leader served as a role model for both commitments to the organization and organizational members and overall service to people and the mission.

*Greg:* Well, again, I would say and again this is something I said in that tribute another think that was true about Brad that was particularly was encouraged commitment from me, I, how gracious Brad was and just how much of the milk of human kindness flowed through his veins (*Code 1: character, gracious; Group Code: integrity, authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). You know, I think again that just wasn't a line of distinction, for Brad, between his official duties and his human duties because of that you could just see (*Code 1: consistent; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). You must have seen this many times. Something happened with a student or a faculty member or staff member anything and Brad would have tears in his eyes just you know obviously that's just a certain kind of person (*Code 1: vulnerability; Group Code: authenticity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). That's not fair to the person who doesn't have that happen to them isn't sympathetic. But when you see someone like Brad that happens to them in those situations, and as genuine as he was, what it revealed to me was that Brad truly cared about the people with whom he worked (*Code 1: care; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). Therefore, whom he was serving (*Code 1: service; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). And that just draws out of any person a real commitment because you see this person cares about not just about me, this person doesn't just care about me but about everyone at this institution in a serious way, in a personal way in a human way (*Code 1: care, service, leader commitment; Group Code: service, commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*). It's not just, I'm here to be the person who is in charge and I'm here to be the person who is making a salary and doing his job and getting to fly around the country. The President is a person who cared deeply about what he was doing and the people he was serving (*Code 1: care, service; Group Code: service; Final group Code: role modeling*). The funny thing is talking about servant leadership. Personally, I don't know that Brad knew what that term meant when he came to the University at all. And we used to throw that term around and Brad from time to time would throw it around but I don't think it was a term he was familiar with. And I don't think he really understood the meaning of it, but the ironic thing is it described him perfectly. Here's a guy, who was, just by his nature a servant

leader, who didn't really know that terminology (*Code 1: service; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). Didn't exactly have that definition of that. Clearly it is. But had it resonated with his heart. I always felt it was kind of interesting.

**Kara:** Well, again, this might sound strange but it might not surprise you...the fact that he had had the sense of humor that he had, for me was very important because it just it always felt refreshing to be able to just have a little levity and joke a little bit and then all of that you know you're going back to work (*Code 1: sense of humor; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*)...There is no doubt I felt like I could tell him anything about related to work because usually visiting about, but like I said we also talk theater and things like that (*Code 1: common ground; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). There's nothing about Brad that isn't trustworthy and you can't say that about everyone (*Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

**Ray:** Relationship building, his ability to vision in every meeting he ever had (*Code 1: relationship building, vision; Group Code: building relationships, vision; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). It wasn't, you know him, he always, he may not have been the most practical man ever to walk the face of the earth but he has, he has a wide eye (*Code 1: dreaming; Group Code: vision; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)...as I said to him, his ability to treat people as colleagues to never, never, look down at them (*Code 1: collegial; Group Code: building relationship; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I didn't have the kind of...knowledge that he had...I admired those same kinds of qualities in Brad when I saw them (*Code 1: common ground; Group Code: building relationship; Final Group Code: quality relationships*)...The thing that I most admire is Brad's availability (*Code 1: visible; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*).

**Mark:** I think, I think one of the areas that I felt very safe (*Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*) because about Brad...because of his skills, because of his commitment, and he cared and his caring attitudes towards the university (*Code 1: leader commitment, care; Group Code: commitment, service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). Let me give a good example...a touchy situation and one of the things I found out just observe him from outside that he was methodical to get a consensus... (*Code 1: clear communication, team; Group Code: transparency; democratic Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). They bought in (*Code 1: bought in; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role model*)...And, one other reason I think that was very limited resentment he told them that we need to change not for the sake of change but because the content of the mission of this institution is changing (*Code 1: vision,*

*shared information; Group Code: vision, transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication)...So, I think he was a master of communication and people skills (Group Code: transparency, building relationships Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication)...And one of the things I have to say this some we some leaders throw people under the bus to save themselves (Code 1: got my back; Group Code: affirmation Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy)...Brad was the one that knew that he is not going to do that to you...Brad would say I'll stick with you (Code 1: got my back; Group Code: affirmation Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy). And, you had this sense that Brad will stick with you for a long time to come (Code 1: got my back; Group Code: affirmation Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy)...He had a high degree of integrity and honesty (Code 1: integrity, honesty; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships). I felt very comfortable (Code 1: personable; Group Code: building relationships Final Group Code: quality relationships)...I think Brad has never failed me (Code 1: trust; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships). I mean he was a straightforward (Code 1: straightforward; Group Code: integrity). He said yes. I mean, he said no, other reason to say no and he didn't bother me because he was very honest (Code 1: honest; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships). I think his leadership styles and I think he should continue and I'm sure that honesty, integrity is extremely important because if a leader does not have integrity and honesty there's no communication (Code 1: integrity, honesty; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships)...his commitment was that he wanted...he was sincere to see this university become a better place for everyone (Code 1: leader commitment, authenticity, service; Group Code: commitment, authenticity, service Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling). He wasn't doing it because he wanted to show himself up. If you look at Brad is quite interesting. He is a he is he walks a way (Code 1: walks the walk; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships)...when you see him he comes across and he will try to be as objective as you could. He did not exaggerate (Code 1: straightforward; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships). He said what, what is a rabbit is a rabbit (Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication). And, his commitment (Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment, Final Group Code: role modeling), definitely was very, I knew the fact that he really wants to make this university good for everybody not for himself (Code 1: service; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling).*

*Sam: Quite a few. I mean, I think honesty, you know, he is a very honest person (Code 1: honest; Group Code: integrity, authenticity Final Group Code: quality relationships). And I think that's really...you know, I never felt like there was a hidden agenda or you didn't know what was going on (Code 1: openness, direct, honest; Group Code: transparency, integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships)...The only way*

I think we can be successful is to work together. And he was really, really good at that. So you always felt included always felt like you knew what was happening (*Code 1: inclusion; Group Code: building relationships Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And I think for a leader that's really important to know that you know everything that's going on (*Code 1: shared information; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)...I always knew what was happening. There were no surprises (*Code 1: clear communication; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*)...I think you know his I would say his participation (*Code 1: visible; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...So he made it a priority. And that was that was a big deal to everyone in the Department. I mean being visible is important (*Code 1: visible; Group Code: Commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*).

*Researcher:* Did you look at him in some ways as a role model?

*Sam:* Oh absolutely (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). No question...I think that's the thing that most inspired me or motivated me is the things that he does well that I need to do better (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). I look at him and I go you know you need, you need to do a little better, that, you know, he is he's a great leadership role model (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). He's a great personal role model because, again, very involved in the community (*Code 1: role model, service; Group Code: role model, service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). Just a humble guy, you know, and just, yeah, I don't have enough good things about him (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity, authenticity Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

*Paula:* It's pretty hard not to work your hardest for somebody like you just said a minute ago, who isn't walking the walk. Brad walked the walk (*Code 1: walked the walk; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And Dawn walked the walk. And, you know, so when you were putting in all the hours you knew he was to he didn't have a sort of I'm just going to let you do what you can do so I don't have to. It was. It was more of we all have to do this if we're going to be successful and I'm going to lead by example (*Code 1: lead by example; Group Code: role model*). So, that...that to me was really, really, I think pretty influential in my commitment was that I knew I wasn't alone (*Code 1: had my back; Group Code: affirmation Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). He was putting in the same amount of time differently (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...

*Mary:* Just genuineness, authenticity, trustworthiness, you know, thoughtfulness too (*Code 1: genuine, authentic, trust, thoughtful; Group Code: authentic, integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I don't think he was hasty when he made

decisions (*Code 1: thoughtful; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships*). And, the other thing about Dr. Bradley that was true for me was that when I did talk to him he was very direct (*Code 1: direct; Group Code: transparency; Final Group Code: transparent communication*). If he didn't want to go in a particular direction he would say so upfront and that sometimes can be difficult. That, you know, that can sometimes be difficult if it's not exactly what you're thinking but I really, there really was integrity and honesty there that was communicated (*Code 1: integrity, honesty, transparency; Group Code: integrity, transparency; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). So, for me...I just to reiterate that you know his modeling (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*) was important and trusting him was huge and also just a sense of integrity and honesty but also a tenderness of heart, knowing that he had the best interests of people uppermost in his mind (*Code 1: trust, integrity, honesty, care; Group Code: integrity, service; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*). And not, not a big ego (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity Final Group Code: quality relationships*). I think that should be added too. He really, I never felt like he, that it was about him in the sense of stealing credit or the focus or any of that (*Code 1: humility; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He really was a conduit for good things to happen within the college that goal always seemed present for me that really, was really involved in service, obviously at a very high level, but nevertheless there was never a feeling of grabbing authority (*Code 1: service, humility; Group Code: service, integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*). He was never authoritarian in anyway (*Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*).

*Tammy:* Well, I think the fact that his dedication was obvious (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*). He set the right, you know you could look up to him as a role model (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*). I always felt he was honest and integrity (*Code 1: honesty, integrity; Group Code: integrity; Final Group Code: quality relationships*). He was not authoritative (*Code 1: not authoritative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). He worked with you (*Code 1: participative; Group Code: democratic; Final Group Code: quality relationships, transparent communication*). You know, him and Dawn showed up every year on [the dinner auction] takedown (*Code 1: service; Group Code: service; Final Group Code: role modeling*). He didn't have to do that. He didn't have to go to all the games he went to. So, his commitment was very obvious and I think it encourages the same commitment from his team, in most people (*Code 1: leader commitment; Group Code: commitment; Final Group Code: role modeling*)...I think it, whether it was the board or him, his suggestion that I obtain an advanced degree (*Code 1: encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group*

*Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*)...that he did support me in continuing my growth (*Code 1: support, encouraged growth; Group Code: affirmation; Final Group Code: quality relationships, self-efficacy*). And he knew too it probably wasn't going to help me professionally, so what's left? Personally, that's all that's left.

*Pete:* I would say the way he opened up his home was helpful, you know in that it demonstrated that those of us on the cabinet aren't just cogs (*Code 1: building relationships; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

*Elaine:* I think observing him be such a people person and wanting to get to know students, staff, alumni, faculty, people in the community (*Code 1: personable, role model; Group Code: building relationships, role model; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*). That's something that I take away from a leader like that. How personable you can be and still be in a respected position (*Code 1: role model; Group Code: role model; Final Group Code: role modeling*)... It's important because you need that to motivate wanting to do a good job and sort of wanting to prove yourself to the leader (*Code 1: trust, loyalty; Group Code: integrity, role model; Final Group Code: quality relationships, role modeling*)...I think again being such a people person and he seemed to gain energy from being around people and finding common ground with, with others (*Code 1: common ground, personable; Group Code: building relationships; Final Group Code: quality relationships*).

The most prevalent theme emerged as quality relationships (47), which included group codes integrity (23), authenticity (7), affirmation (6), building relationships (4), and democratic (4). Integrity included the following initial codes: honesty (7), trust (6), integrity (5), straightforward (2), character (1), thoughtful (1), consistent (1), and walk the walk (1). Authenticity included the following initial codes: humility (4), authenticity (2), vulnerable (1), genuine (1), and gracious (1). Affirmation included the following initial codes: had my back (4), encouraged growth (2), and support (1). Building relationships included the following initial codes: common ground (3), personable (3), building relationships (2), inclusion, (1), collegial (1), and sense of humor (1). Finally, democratic included the following initial codes: not authoritative (2), team (1), and participative (1). Again, Cho and Perry (2012) argued that leader trustworthiness increased follower intrinsic motivation. The data supported this argument in the themes of integrity and authenticity, which clearly indicated trust, honesty, and humility as leader behaviors that increased intrinsic motivation. Integrity and authenticity were further supported by quality relationships that included participatory activity and affirmation.

The second prevalent theme emerged as role modeling (3), which included group codes service (12), commitment (11), and role model (10). Service included two initial codes:

service (7) and care (4). Commitment included the following initial codes: leader commitment (7), visible (3), bought in (1), and loyalty (1). Role model included two initial codes: role model (7) and lead by example (1). House (1976) indicated that leaders can inspire followers to “emulate” them (p. 6). The data supported the concept of emulation as followers looked to their leader's commitment and service to inspire and fuel their intrinsic motivation.

Transparent communication (13) included group codes transparency (9) and vision (2). Transparency included the following initial codes: clear communication (3), direct (2), transparency (1), openness (1), shared information (1), and synthesized information (1). Vision included the initial codes vision (2) and dreaming (1). Self-efficacy (6) included the group code of affirmation (6). Affirmation included the following initial codes: had my back (4), encouraged growth (2), and support (1). Again, transparent communication increased the overall trust followers felt towards the leader. Coupled with continued affirmation, follower's intrinsic motivation increased while supported by transparent communication and affirmation.

## Conclusion

The study presented a mixed methods study seeking to further Winston's (2003) conceptualization of a circular model of servant leadership, by providing empirical evidence which may be used to develop a valid instrument to test the circular model presented by Winston (2003) in the future. Data saturation occurred at eight interviews. However, as ten interviews had been scheduled, all ten were completed. The data analysis indicated four salient themes: quality relationships, transparent communication, self-efficacy, and role modeling.

The variable of commitment to the leader found support in the final group codes of quality relationships (76), transparent communication (63), role modeling (24), and self-efficacy (17). The data indicated distinct support for affirming behaviors, relationship building, integrity and authenticity on the part of the leader, participatory engagement, active listening, and clear communication. The data supported the literature in the areas of relationship quality, participatory leader behaviors, and clear communication of vision and goals (Bass, 2000; House, 1976; Shamir, et al., 1993).

The variable of self-efficacy found support in the final group codes of quality relationships (95), self-efficacy (87), transparent communication (17), and role modeling (9). The data indicated distinct support for affirming behaviors, integrity and authenticity on the part of the leader, autonomy, transparent and democratic communication, and a modeling of commitment and service on the part of the leader. The data supported the literature in the areas of influence of social environment, relationship influence on self-efficacy, and the impact of psychological empowerment



(Winston, 2003; Poon, 2006; van Dierendonck & Dijkstra, 2012). Additionally, the data indicated the influence of autonomy on follower experiences of self-efficacy.

The variable of intrinsic motivation found the most support from quality relationships (122) and nearly equal support from transparent communication (45), self-efficacy (45), and role modeling (41). The data indicated distinct support for affirming behaviors, integrity and authenticity on the part of the leader, mutual trust, and the building of the relationship. In addition, the data indicated equal support for the impact of self-efficacy, transparent communication, and role modeling on intrinsic motivation. In particular, affirming behaviors, active listening, transparency, leader commitment, and leader role modeling of service to others impacted follower intrinsic motivation.

The data analysis provides empirical evidence to support the three variables of commitment to the leader, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation as presented in Winston's (2003) circular model of servant leadership. The themes and codes provided in the analysis present a first step in item generation to develop a scale measuring Winston's (2003) model. The next steps in developing a measurement scale could include the replication of this study with another leader to eliminate possibilities of bias (Patton, 2015). However, item generation could begin and utilize an expert panel to review the coding completed by the single researcher in this study. Finally, validation and assessment of generalizability and bias would continue as the scale undergoes factor analysis and construct validation.

---

### About the Author

Elizabeth Hunt is an Assistant Professor and Co-Chair of the Department of Communications and Director of Character in Leadership at the University of Jamestown in Jamestown, ND. She is currently working on her Ph.D. in organizational leadership from Regent University. Her research interests include sensemaking, leadership communication, organizational culture and climate, servant leadership, and values and character education.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Elizabeth Hunt at [elizhun@mail.regent.edu](mailto:elizhun@mail.regent.edu) or [lhunt@uj.edu](mailto:lhunt@uj.edu).

---

### References

Baker, S. D., Mathis, C. J., & Stites-Doe, S. (2011). An exploratory study investigating leader and follower characteristics at U.S. healthcare organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 23(3), 341-363.

- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18-40.
- Berson, Y., Halevy, N., Shamir, B., & Erez, M. (2015). Leading from different psychological distances: A construal-level perspective on vision communication, goal setting, and follower motivation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 143-155.
- Billot, J., West, D., Khon, L., Skorobohacz, C., Roxa, T., Murray, S., & Gayle, B. (2013). Followership in higher education: Academic teachers and their formal leaders. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(2), 91-103.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Dennis, R., & Bocarnea, M. C. (2006). Servant leadership assessment instrument (SLAI): Instrument profile. In R.A. Reynolds, R. Woods, and J.D. Baker (Eds.), *Handbooks of research on electronic surveys and measurements*, pp. 336-340.
- Francis, J. J., Johnston, M., Robertson, C., Glidewell, L., Entwistle, V., Eccles, M.P., & Grimshaw, J.M. (2010). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology and Health*, 25(10), 1229-1245.
- Greenleaf, R. (2008). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1), 42-55.
- Harrell, M. M. (2008). *The relationships between leader behavior, follower motivation, and performance*. University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL.
- Harris-Wilson, E. (2017). *The effects of the empowering role of followers on leaders: A phenomenological perspective*. (Ph.D.), Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Hawkins, K. (2016). *Followers' perspective of followership in the higher education industry*. (Ph.D.), Capella University, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Hood, J. P. (2015). *The followers' journey: A phenomenological study of Greenleaf's proposed follower outcomes of servant leadership*. Capella University, Ann Arbor, MI.
- House, R. J. (1976). *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership*. Working Paper Series 76-06.
- Hunt, E. (2017). *University perceptions of presidential servant leadership*. Unpublished manuscript.

- Cho, Y. J., & Perry, J. L. (2012). Intrinsic motivation and employee attitudes: Role of managerial trustworthiness, goal directedness, and extrinsic reward expectancy. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(4), 382-406.
- Kantabutra, S., & Vimolratana, P. (2010). Vision-based leaders and their followers in retail stores: Relationships and consequences in Australia. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 26(6), 123-134.
- Kellerman, B. (2007). What every leader needs to know about followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(12), 84-91.
- Kelly, R. E. (2008). Rethinking followership. In R.E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Bluman (Ed.), *The Art of Followership* (pp. 5-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maroosis, J. (2008). Leadership: A partnership in reciprocal following. In I. C. R.E. Riggio, & J. Lipman-Bluman (Ed.), *The Art of Followership* (pp. 17-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Marshall, M. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*, 13 (522-525).
- Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *FQS*, 11(3).
- Morris, R. (2014). Constructions of following from a relational perspective: A follower-focused study. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(14), 51-62.
- Moustakes, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patterson, K. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. (Ph.D.), Regent, Virginia Beach VA. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com/library.regent.edu/docview/305234239?accountid=13479> (Order No. 3082719)
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Poon, R. (2006). A model for servant leadership, self-efficacy and mentorship. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University.
- Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594.

- Stech, E. L. .(2008). A new leadership-followership paradigm. In I. C. R.E. Riggio, & J. Lipman-Bluman (Ed.), *The Art of Followership* (pp. 41-52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tu, Y., & Lu, X. (2016). Do ethical leaders give followers the confidence to go the extra mile? The moderating role of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(1), 129-144.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 83-104.
- van Dierendonck, D., & Dijkstra, M. (2012). The role of the follower in the relationship between empowering leadership and empowerment: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(E1-E20).
- Winston, B. (2002). *Be a leader for God's sake*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University-School of Leadership.
- Winston, B. (2003). Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and follower interact in a circular model. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University.