

Social work perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership in health care

Zvi D. Gellis

Despite the resurgence of leadership research, few investigations have examined the association between leadership behaviors and organizational performance in the social work field. The purpose of this study was to evaluate empirically a model that delineates two types of leadership processes, transformational and transactional leadership, within social work practice as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The model was tested with a sample of 187 clinical social workers employed in hospitals. Results indicated that all five transformational factors and one transactional factor were significantly correlated with leader outcomes of effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. Implications for social work practice are provided.

Key words: clinical social workers; effectiveness; leadership; transactional; transformational

Zvi D. Gellis, PhD, is assistant professor, School of Social Welfare, University at Albany, State University of New York, 135 Western Avenue, Richardson Hall 210, Albany, NY 12222, e-mail gellis@albany.edu. The author thanks Dr Burt Gummer and Dr Lynn Videka-Sherman for their comments on the manuscript.

Little empirical attention has been given in the social work literature to the concepts of leadership and organizational performance (Malka, 1989, Patti, 1987). Researchers have emphasized that investigation of management characteristics and behavior constitutes a critical area for social work (Gummer, 1995, Hasenfeld & Schmid, 1989, Malka, 1989). Others have called for expanded training in leadership practice in schools of social work (Brilliant, 1986, Patti, 1987).

Bargal and Schmid (1989) reviewed the management literature and suggested such themes as transformational leadership, vision and strategy, and organizational culture to be useful to the social work field. They stated that there has been a "changing paradigm in research on organizations . . . and these themes represent holistic and interdisciplinary approaches to understanding leadership approaches" (p. 52).

At a theoretical level, transformational leadership has the potential to be instructive to the social work field (Gummer, 1995). Therefore, this research investigated social workers' perceptions of the degree to which their managers practice transformational leadership, and of leader attitudes and behaviors that social workers associate with organizational effectiveness. No previous studies have been identified that extend the theory of transformational leadership in the social work and health field.

Rarely have models of leadership practice been advanced in social welfare (Ezell, Menefee, & Patti, 1989). Berg (1980) developed a "proactive"—"reactive" model of leadership style. In this model, proactive leaders are associated with attributes of risk taking, innovation, and change, whereas reactive leaders are depicted as maintaining the status quo and avoiding risk taking and change. Ezell et al. described a model of social work administration whereby managerial behaviors produced or enhance desired client outcomes.

Austin (1989) stated that the appropriate behavioral model for the human services was "interactive leadership." This model emphasized the pattern of personal interaction between the manager and other staff in the organization, using a problem-solving approach within participatory groups. Hasenfeld and Schmid (1989) described a life cycle model of social services organizations from a management perspective incorporating concepts such as transactional, management by exception, and transformational leadership within their stages of maturation and elaboration.

Existing social work studies on leadership have numerous methodological limitations. Some lack adequate samples and do not rely on systematic observations of leadership behavior, whereas others lack operational definitions of leadership practice (Malka, 1989; Wernet & Austin, 1991). Other studies rely on the reporting and perception of a small number of respondents (Jansson & Simmons, 1986). Also, inadequate attention is paid to issues of reliability and validity of measurement instruments (Wernet & Austin, 1991).

Relevant literature informative to social work examines leadership in teams and organizations (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Gummer, 1997). New research strands in the organizational field have been developed and have focused on transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) and the related concepts of charismatic (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) and inspirational leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY

Bass's (1985) theory of transformational leadership was developed from Burns's (1978) thesis of transactional and transformational political leaders. In transactional leadership, leader-follower relationships are based on a series of exchanges between them. Bass's (1985) research has identified two factors composing transactional leadership. First, contingent reward leadership is viewed as an active and positive exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers are rewarded for accomplishing agreed-on objectives. Conversely, leaders also can transact actively or passively with followers by focusing on mistakes, delaying decisions, or avoiding situations until problems arise. Bass refers to such behavioral exchanges as management by exception (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Bass and his colleagues stated that the essence of transformational leadership is to produce organizational change through its emphasis on new values,

and a vision of the future, which transcends the status quo (Bass & Avolio, 1994). A central argument of Bass's (1985) theory is that transformational leadership goes beyond transactional behaviors by developing intellectually stimulating and inspiring followers to put aside their own interests for a collective (team, unit) purpose. Bass described transformational leadership as comprising four conceptually distinct factors: (1) charisma (idealized influence attributes and behaviors), (2) intellectual stimulation, (3) individual consideration, and (4) inspirational motivation. *Charisma* refers to the leader's ability to arouse devotion and articulate a vision through personal dynamics such as self-confidence and emotional appeal, for subordinates to identify with and develop higher order goals, and instill respect and loyalty for the leader. The charisma factor is separated into idealized behaviors and attributes (Bass & Avolio, 1997). *Intellectual stimulation* refers to the leader's ability to understand and solve problems in novel ways, to "break with the past." *Individual consideration* refers to the leader's ability to treat each subordinate with care and concern (Bass, 1985). *Inspirational motivation* orients subordinates toward action, building confidence, and inspiring belief in a cause.

An understanding of transformational leadership is necessary to account for the extraordinary efforts often exerted by followers. In contrast to transactional leaders, transformational leaders attempt to elevate follower needs to higher levels, try to develop followers into leaders, and attempt to bring about changes in the culture of the organization. Although transactional and transformational leaders are two distinct types, characteristics of both can be found to differing degrees in the same individual (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Bass (1985) stated that transformational leadership would result in followers performing beyond expected levels of performance as a consequence of the leader's influence. Specifically, followers' level of extra effort may be due, in part, to their commitment to the leader, their intrinsic work motivation, their level of development, or their sense of purpose that drives them to excel beyond ordinary limits. By delineating a vision and shared values, transformational leaders can help units and teams maximize performance. Moreover, teams more open to innovation and risk taking may be more conducive to transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Bass also claimed that transformational behaviors could be learned in organizations.

QUANTITATIVE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to evaluate empirically the nature of leader-follower interactions as conceptualized by Bass (1985), on the basis of social worker's views of their leader. The objectives were to determine the degree to which social work managers were perceived to use transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and to identify which leader behaviors were best able to predict social work leader effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and extra effort by hospital social workers. This study was part of a larger project examining the psychological well-being of hospital social workers in a period of health care reform.

Respondents

Participants in this study included 234 social workers recruited from 26 hospitals located in a large urban setting with a population of 2.5 million. A pilot survey was conducted in one nonparticipating hospital to ensure that the research instrument was interpretable, and to discover whether any difficulties would arise in its administration with the sample. Minor wording changes were made where necessary in the original instrument to clarify the intent of each item. For example, "social worker" was substituted for "subordinates."

A cross-sectional survey design was used. Data were collected by a single questionnaire. The hospitals contributing to the sample were very diverse in their size and included 10 academic teaching hospitals and 16 community hospitals. Participants received the questionnaire and consent form, with a cover letter, in person at their workplace. The researchers were present in the hospitals at prearranged times to answer questions about the study and ensure confidentiality. No identifying information was requested on the questionnaires. Previous evidence supported increased reliability and validity of self-reports when confidentiality is ensured (Howard, 1994). The 187 completed and usable questionnaires were returned (80 percent response rate). The identified leaders for this study were the participants' direct managers in their respective health care organizations.

The hospitals in which this study was conducted were experiencing dramatic changes in services delivery largely because of major reforms in the health care industry. Interviews with 26 social work managers and perusal of long-range hospital plans indicated that further upheaval was anticipated over the next five years. The high uncertainty and turbulence characterizing hospital environments provided a

context more likely to be conducive to the emergence of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Measures

Demographic Form. Respondents were asked to indicate their age and gender, the highest level of education attained, the number of years in practice, the number of years at their current employment, as well as their social work practice specialty.

Leadership Behavior. Leadership behavior was measured with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X), a 45-item measure devised by Bass and Avolio (1990). Five subscales of the MLQ 5X measured transformational leader behaviors: (1) idealized influence attributed (sample item: "goes beyond the self-interest for the good of the group"), (2) idealized influence behaviors (sample item: "specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose"); (3) inspirational motivation (sample item: "expresses confidence that goals will be achieved"); (4) intellectual stimulation (sample item: "seeks differing perspectives when solving problems"); and (5) individualized consideration (sample item: "considers each individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others").

Four subscales of the MLQ used to measure transactional leadership were (1) contingent reward (sample item: "points out what I will receive if I do what needs to be done"); (2) active management by exception (sample item: "is alert for failure to meet standards"); (3) passive management by exception (sample item: "things have to go wrong for him or her to take action"); and (4) laissez-faire (sample item: "avoids making decisions"). The laissez-faire subscale measures the absence or avoidance of leadership.

Participants were asked to judge how frequently their social work manager engaged in specific behaviors measured by the MLQ. Each behavior was rated on a five-point frequency scale ranging from 0 = not at all to 4 = frequently if not always. The five-point scale had a magnitude estimation-based ratio of 4:3:2:1:0, according to a list of anchors tested by Bass (1985). Participants' responses to items were scored according to the key in the questionnaire manual (Bass & Avolio, 1997). In this study the subscales of the MLQ have good internal consistency with Cronbach's alphas meeting Nunnally's (1978) criterion of .70 (Table 1). On the basis of confirmatory factor analyses using PLS and LISREL, Bass and his colleagues obtained adequate convergent as well as discriminant validity for the constructs

TABLE 1—Means and Standard Deviations of the MLQ Scales (N = 187)

Measure	M	SD	Study α	α
Transformational leadership				
Idealized attributes	2.11	1.01	.78	.90 ^a
Idealized behaviors	1.97	1.03	.81	.91 ^a
Individual consideration	1.77	1.08	.80	.93 ^a
Inspirational motivation	2.00	1.11	.89	.94 ^a
Intellectual stimulation	1.77	.92	.77	.93 ^a
Transactional leadership				
Contingent reward	1.90	.92	.74	.91 ^a
Active management by exception	1.48	.81	.70	.81 ^a
Passive management by exception	1.67	.99	.75	.87 ^a
Laissez faire	1.27	1.03	.84	.74 ^a
Leader outcomes				
Extra effort	2.11	1.23	.86	.94 ^a
Leader effectiveness	1.67	1.15	.88	.94 ^a
Leader satisfaction	1.49	1.19	.87	.96 ^a

NOTE: Scores range from 0 = not at all to 4 = frequently, if not always.
^aIndicates reliability figure reported by earlier researchers

contained in the leadership instrument (Bass & Avolio, 1997)

Outcome Variables

Extra Effort. Three items were used to measure extra effort: "The leader gets me to do more than I expected I could do"; "The leader motivates me to do more than I thought I could do"; and "The leader heightens my motivation to succeed" (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The extra effort scale reflects the extent to which social workers exert effort beyond the ordinary as a consequence of the leadership. Cronbach's alpha for the global scale of extra effort was .86

Leader Effectiveness. Four items were used to measure effectiveness (Bass & Avolio, 1990). A sample item included the following: "The leader is effective in meeting organizational requirements." The effectiveness scale reflects a leader's effectiveness as seen by others in four domains: (1) meeting the job-related needs of social workers, (2) representing social work needs to higher level managers; (3) contributing to organizational effectiveness; and (4) performance by the leader's work group. This scale attained a Cronbach's alpha of .88 in this study.

Leader Satisfaction. Two items were used to measure leader satisfaction: "The leader uses methods of leadership that are satisfying", and "In gen-

eral, I am satisfied with the leader's style" (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Leader satisfaction reflects how satisfied social workers are with the leader in general. Cronbach's alpha for the global scale of leader satisfaction was .87

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations of all variables were calculated. Bivariate analysis was performed to evaluate relations between the variables in the study. A series of hierarchical regressions were performed to examine the effects of the predictors on the outcome variables.

RESULTS

The 187 practicing social workers from 26 hospitals in a large urban setting responded to the MLQ (Form 5X) items about their immediate managers. The sample consisted of two levels of educational training: 168 (89 percent) MSW and 19 (11 percent) BSW. Most were female (86 percent) with an average age of 42.9 years ($SD = 8.9$). The MSW group was older and had slightly more years of work experience and organizational tenure than the BSW group. The social workers were employed in a variety of units (51 percent medical/surgical, 15 percent psychiatry; 12 percent emergency; 6 percent pediatrics, 5 percent rehabilitation; 4 percent geriatric; 3 percent

intensive care; 2 percent neonatal and maternity, 1 percent burn unit, 1 percent cardiology).

Scores for the MLQ were calculated by averaging item scores for each factor. Means for each of the MLQ leadership factors were near the midpoint (2.0 on a 0 to 4 scale) with standard deviations near 1.0.

Table 2 reports on the Pearson product-moment correlations between MLQ leadership factors and outcome variables and revealed that idealized attributes and behaviors, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and contingent reward were significantly related ($p < .01$) to perceived leader effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and extra effort by social workers. These correlations approximated those reported by Bass and Avolio (1997). The transactional factor of contingent reward was also positively correlated with the three rated outcomes, but at a significantly lower magnitude than transformational leader factors. Management-by-exception factors were either not correlated with rated leader outcomes or were negatively correlated consistent with previous research (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

Applying a hierarchical regression procedure used by Waldman, Bass, and Einstein (1987) and Hater and Bass (1988), transactional leadership factors were first entered into the regression model to determine whether transformational leadership significantly augmented the power of transactional leadership alone in predicting effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. Significance of the R^2 change caused by the addition of transformational leadership factors was tested. The R^2 for the transactional factors

was .47 ($p < .001$) for leader satisfaction, .55 ($p < .001$) for leader effectiveness, and .43 ($p < .001$) for extra effort (Table 3). The addition of transformational factors significantly increased the R^2 for satisfaction to .75, for effectiveness to .79, and for extra effort to .69. Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino (1990) previously reported increases in R^2 of from .09 to .48 depending on the sample and the criterion variable used. On the basis of these results, transformational leadership behaviors appeared to be associated with higher levels of performance and satisfaction.

Table 4 shows the results of regression analyses without forced entry of the leadership factors. Only the transformational factors—idealized attributes and individual consideration—appeared to be significant in predicting satisfaction with the leader, whereas individual consideration, idealized attribute, and contingent reward (transactional) factors were significant predictors of perceived leader effectiveness. The active management-by-exception dimension was not related to contingent reward. Not surprisingly, the laissez-faire scale was negatively related with satisfaction and effectiveness, noting that subordinates were more satisfied with transformational leaders and perceived them as more effective than laissez-faire leaders. Consistent with past leadership research, contingent reward was significantly related in the positive direction to all five transformational factors. Because of the multicollinearity of the factors, though, interpretation of the specific effects of each factor is made more difficult, and the strong association between the dependent variables makes interpretation even more complex.

TABLE 2—Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between MLQ Leadership Scales and Outcome Variables (N = 187)

Leadership Factors	Extra Effort	Satisfaction	Effectiveness
Idealized attributes	.73*	.80*	.80*
Idealized behaviors	.69*	.71*	.74*
Individual consideration	.80*	.77*	.81*
Intellectual stimulation	.70*	.69*	.72*
Inspirational motivation	.64*	.67*	.70*
Contingent reward	.66*	.67*	.74*
Management by exception (active)	-.14	-.24	-.22
Management by exception (passive)	-.42*	-.55*	-.54*
Laissez-faire	-.52*	-.69*	-.66*

$p < .01$

TABLE 3—Regression Results for Leader Satisfaction, Effectiveness, and Extra Effort

Step	Variable	R ²	Change in R ²	F ratio	p
Satisfaction					
1	Transactional factors	47		163.92	.001
2	Transformational factors	75	.28	18.57	.001
Effectiveness					
1	Transactional factors	55		221.28	.001
2	Transformational factors	79	.24	20.21	.001
Extra effort					
1	Transactional factors	43		140.68	.001
2	Transformational factors	69	.26	23.46	.001

The correlation between the dependent variables of satisfaction with the leader and perceived effectiveness was strong ($r = .86, p < .01$). However, according to Bass's (1985) theory, leader satisfaction and leader effectiveness were presumed to measure

different aspects of the leader. This finding could have been due to the sample, or the version of the MLQ (Form 5x) used by the researchers, because several versions of the scale exist (Bass & Avolio, 1997). What accounts for perceived effectiveness

TABLE 4—MLQ Factors as Predictors of Leader Satisfaction, Leader Effectiveness, and Extra Effort (N=187)

Step	Variable Entered	B	t	p	Model R ²
Satisfaction					
1 (TF)	Idealized attributes	79	18.07	.001	.64
2 (TF)	Idealized attributes	45	6.94	.001	
(TF)	Individual consideration	33	4.98	.001	.70
3 (TF)	Idealized attributes	34	5.22	.001	
(TF)	Individual consideration	27	4.13	.001	
(TA)	Laissez-faire	-24	-3.83	.001	.75
Effectiveness					
1 (TF)	Individual consideration	81	18.78	.001	.66
2 (TF)	Individual consideration	46	8.07	.001	
(TF)	Idealized attributes	45	7.89	.001	.74
3 (TF)	Individual consideration	31	5.09	.001	
(TF)	Idealized attributes	29	4.71	.001	
(TA)	Contingent Reward	19	3.18	.01	
(TA)	Laissez faire	-18	-3.15	.01	.78
Extra Effort					
1 (TF)	Individual consideration	79	17.88	.001	.43
2 (TF)	Individual consideration	.57	8.69	.001	
(TF)	Idealized attributes	30	4.69	.001	.68

NOTE: TF = transformational leadership, TA = transactional leadership

once the association with satisfaction is removed? Further examination of this issue suggested the use of a hierarchical regression procedure. Satisfaction was entered first into a model predicting perceived effectiveness followed by the leadership factors. Only one MLQ factor, individual consideration, significantly augmented the predictive power of satisfaction, which increased the model R^2 from .74 to .82 ($p < .01$). Furthermore, what accounts for perceived satisfaction with the leader when the relationship with leader effectiveness is extracted? The same procedure was used entering effectiveness into a model predicting perceived satisfaction followed by the leadership factors. Only the idealized attribute factor significantly enhanced the predictive power of satisfaction with the leader, which increased the model R^2 from .74 to .80 ($p < .01$).

DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest that transformational leadership did have significant and substantial add-on effects to transactional leadership in the prediction of perceived effectiveness and satisfaction with the leader in a social work sample. These variables are relevant to the add-on hypothesis, namely, that transformational leadership generates increased levels of a subordinate's effort and performance beyond what transactional processes do. The findings in this study corroborated the hypothesis that the idealized attribute and individual consideration factors add unique variance beyond contingent reward behavior in relation to leader effectiveness and satisfaction. This finding offers further support to what Bass described as the augmentation phenomenon resulting in potentially superior group performance (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Waldman et al., 1990). It indicates that the transformational factors may be effective in enhancing positive attitudes and behaviors among social workers on the job. Whether social work leaders have a positive or negative effect on an organization may depend on how these individuals are selected and trained.

Operationally, the augmentation effect has been demonstrated through the use of regression analysis (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Waldman et al. (1990) found significant F ratios for the change in multiple R s when a block of mean transformational scale scores was entered after a block of mean transactional scale scores using this type of regression analysis.

Although the regression results in this study have been used to argue that transformational leadership adds to group performance over and above transactional leadership, several comments are warranted.

First, the multicollinearity of the MLQ data may have been a concern. However, multicollinearity was examined through a computerized statistical package by calculating the variance inflation factors, which showed that none were greater than 2 (Fox, 1991). Waldman et al. (1990) stated that regression techniques could help to deal with some of the problems associated with multicollinearity. They noted that the a priori ordering of the leadership blocks inferred a structure that accounted for their intercorrelations and the blocking of these two leadership dimensions overcomes the problems associated with interpretation of unique factors within a block (Waldman et al., 1990). The augmentation effect may occur primarily because of the order in which the transformational and transactional blocks are entered into regression equations. It also may be that the transformational leadership factors not only augment the variance accounted for by transactional leadership but in a sense overwhelm it. In addition, Bass (1985) emphasized that transformational leadership builds on transactional leadership but not vice versa.

A note of caution is suggested in interpreting some of the reported relationships due to the potential for single-source bias and data aggregation procedures (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984; Howard, 1994). Subordinates provided measures of leadership and outcome measures of satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. Relationships between subordinate-rated leadership behavior and subordinate-rated effectiveness and satisfaction were high, also due in part to single-source bias. Nevertheless, the same pattern of findings was obtained in other studies with different samples (Hater & Bass, 1988; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995).

Transformational leadership has been shown to play an important role in many outcomes that have been of interest to organizational researchers. This is supported by the results in this study and is consistent with previous research findings. Other studies have demonstrated that ratings of leadership effectiveness relate positively and significantly to transformational leadership factors and negatively to management by exception (Hater & Bass, 1988; Waldman et al., 1990).

Bass and Avolio (1994) hypothesized that transformational leadership would have a greater effect on a follower's performance in organizations experiencing change and unstable work environments. Similar conditions characterized the settings in which this research was conducted and may account for the generally positive and significant correlations

These findings are a preliminary step in the quest to advance our understanding of the leadership processes in the social work field. Moreover, the results have ramifications for human services administration and supervision.

Implications for Social Work

This research delineates five dimensions of transformational leadership that may provide utility to social work in producing work behavior beyond expectations. The strong correlations between all the transformational leadership factors and the extra effort scale are worthy of discussion. The higher the rating of the social work manager as transformational, the increased desire of social workers to engage in activities requested by their leader, even though the demands went beyond what was expected of them. Moreover, social workers reported more satisfaction with the style and methods of transformational leaders. Social workers rated their leaders as more effective in meeting their job-related needs, representing them to higher-level administrators; and contributing to organizational effectiveness. These findings corroborate recent studies in which transformational leadership was, on average, strongly and positively correlated with the three outcome measures of extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and leader effectiveness, when compared with transactional factors (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Koh et al., 1995).

This article provides some evidence that transformational leaders can be found in social work practice fields. Participants reported that they preferred leaders who engage them in the transformational behaviors associated with individualized consideration and idealized attributes, and the transactional behaviors of contingent rewards. The MLQ results confirm the significance of individual consideration. This factor had a statistically significant positive correlation with effectiveness and extra effort. Therefore, encouraging staff to reflect on new goals and to champion new ideas were essential components of transformational leadership, according to the study participants.

Glisson (1989) echoed the notion that effective leadership in human services organizations consisted of leaders inspiring and motivating their employees toward improved performance. Transformational leadership as a model appeared to provide some guidance for improved performance (Gummer, 1997).

This line of inquiry suggests that the social work leader pay more attention to the various situations that demand interventions. Perhaps, in rapidly

changing human services organizations, work-related situations are more uncertain and difficult to manage (Gummer, 1995). If this is the case, future studies could examine how transformational leaders cope with this kind of situation, how they differ from transactional leaders, and what is the effect on social worker's behavior in terms of occupational stress.

CONCLUSIONS

Health care organizations, as the focus of this study, will change in many significant ways in the new millennium. For the social work manager, skill and knowledge are needed in understanding leadership processes and organizational change. Change in health care necessitates social work leaders to be more results oriented, creative, and innovative within their units (Gummer, 1995); however, the results-oriented perspective will be a major challenge given the process orientation of social work practice. For the frontline social worker, it means increased stress to take on higher patient caseloads and additional discharges.

Like all survey research, this research was subject to a number of limitations. First, any study relying on administration of a single questionnaire can be subject to interpretation problems from common method variance. This variance can result when two or more constructs are measured by a single source or rater. Another limitation involved cross-sectional data, precluding any demonstration of causality in the relationships examined. However, one advantage of using regression techniques is that the effects of the reliabilities on intervariable relationships could be accounted for, thereby increasing confidence in the results.

Suggestions for future research are aimed at moving the social work literature on leadership and organizational performance to consider how managers can most efficiently bring about change. More studies also are needed to examine the effect of leader interventions in rapidly changing health care environments, in changing work patterns, and in team performance. To date, this is the first study to examine the social work perspective on transformational leadership behaviors in a health care setting. In part, this research serves to raise questions and provides direction for more in-depth research on the leadership phenomenon. Subsequent research might use more qualitative data collection methods, such as participant observations or focus group interviews, to further document the leadership process at the unit or team level. ■

REFERENCES

- Austin, M. J. (1989). The human service executive. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 13-36.
- Bargal, D., & Schmid, H. (1989). Recent themes in theory and research on leadership and their implications for management of the human services. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 37-54.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Training and development of transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In R. W. Woodman & W. A. Passmore (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (pp. 231-272). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range of leadership Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berg, W. E. (1980). Evolution of leadership style in social agencies: A theoretical analysis. *Social Casework, 61*, 22-28.
- Brilliant, E. L. (1986). Social work leadership: A missing ingredient? *Social Work, 30*, 325-331.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dansereau, F., Alutto, J., & Yammarino, F. (1984). *Theory testing in organizational behavior: The variant approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ezell, M., Menelec, D., & Patti, R. (1989). Managerial leadership and service quality: Toward a model of social work administration. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 73-98.
- Fox, J. (1991). *Regression diagnostics*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Glisson, C. (1989). The effect of leadership on workers in human service organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 99-116.
- Gummer, B. (1995). Go team go: The growing importance of teamwork in organizational life. *Administration in Social Work, 19*, 85-100.
- Gummer, B. (1997). Organizational identity in a changing environment. *Administration in Social Work, 21*, 169-187.
- Hasenfeld, Y., & Schmid, H. (1989). The life cycle of human service organizations: An administrative perspective. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 243-269.
- Hater, J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superior's evaluation and subordinate's perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 695-702.
- Howard, G. (1994). Why do people say nasty things about self-reports? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 399-404.
- Jansson, B., & Simmons, J. (1986). Building departmental or unit power with human service organizations: Empirical findings and theory building. *Administration in Social Work, 8*, 41-56.
- Koh, W., Steers, R., & Terborg, J. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 319-333.
- Malka, S. (1989). Managerial behavior, participation, and effectiveness in social welfare organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 13*, 47-65.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Patti, R. (1987). Managing for service effectiveness in social welfare: Toward a performance model. *Administration in Social Work, 13*(3/4), 7-21.
- Waldman, D., Bass, B., & Einstein, W. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60*, 177-186.
- Waldman, D., Bass, B., & Yammarino, F. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and Organizational Studies, 15*, 381-394.
- Wernet, S., & Austin, D. (1991). Decision-making style and leadership patterns in nonprofit human service organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 15*, 1-17.

Original manuscript received March 22, 1999
Final revision received August 2, 2000
Accepted September 13, 2000