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ABSTRACT

As the capacity of public leaders to bring about change is increasingly questioned, public agencies have come under pressure to transform and innovate. More research is needed to identify how leaders who promote innovation, creativity, and adaptability affect the performance of public organizations. Constant improvement of organizations and individuals encourages leaders to innovate, evaluate risks as opportunities, and tackle the status quo. This raises the significance of how transformational leadership contributes to organizational performance and reacts to public agencies’ environment, and how it might reorganize them.

The present study examines the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness in public organizations, particularly Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The study specifically focuses on FEMA as an independent agency and as an agency under the Department of Homeland Security. It also measures transformational leadership behaviors and explores how they relate to public employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness as reported by the 2002, 2006, and 2008 Federal Human Capital Surveys (FHCS). Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to validate the construct validity for the perceived leadership
effectiveness measurement model. Structural equation modeling was conducted to examine the study hypotheses.

This study has found that transformational leadership behaviors—idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation—all have a significant relationship with perceived leadership effectiveness. Each dimension of transformational leadership has a positive effect on employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness, with intellectual stimulation having the highest effect. The standardized regression weights of exogenous variables are: .24 for idealized influence, .48 for intellectual stimulation, and .29 for inspirational motivation. Overall, these predictor variables accounted for 86% of the variance in perceived leadership effectiveness.

Findings of the study reveal several organizational, managerial, and policy implications relating to increasing the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on employees’ perceived leadership effectiveness and organizational performance. The study points out the significance of communication and information sharing, and providing sufficient opportunities to do a better job in public organizations. The findings also confirm that the leaders are required to obtain inspirational motivation behaviors and use them to give a feeling of personal empowerment to the employees.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

As the capacity of public leaders to bring about change is increasingly questioned, public agencies have come under pressure to transform and innovate. More research is needed to identify how leaders who promote innovation, creativity, and adaptability affect the performance of public organizations (Fernandez & Rainey, 2006; Fernandez, 2008). Constant improvement of organizations and individuals encourages leaders to innovate, evaluate risks as opportunities, and tackle the status quo. This raises the significance of how transformational leadership contributes and reacts to public agencies’ environment, and how it might reorganize them (Avolio & Bass, 1988).

Recent natural and man-made disasters such as the tsunami in South Asia and Hurricane Katrina in 2005, and the bombings in New York in 2001, Istanbul in 2003 and Madrid in 2004, all illustrate challenges that emergency management has faced in recent years. These disasters became tests for public sector leadership as well, and provided useful lessons for government leaders. After Hurricane Katrina and the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, in particular, leadership failures in response to disasters have become critical (Waugh & Streib, 2006; Kapucu &Van Mart, 2008).

With increasing calls for change and innovation in public agencies (Fernandez, 2008), leaders are expected to manage their organizations more effectively and
efficiently. As employees attempt to respond in chaotic environments, transformative leaders take change (Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1995). These individuals possess a heightened awareness and confidence, and move followers from concerns for survival to concerns for accomplishment and growth (Bass & Avolio 1994).

In this study, it is assumed that transformational leadership is the proper path to public sector leadership and to the type of innovation, change management, creativity, and adaptability necessary for the public-agency environment, particularly in the case of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Transformational leadership is especially important in response to man-made and natural disasters. It can also play role in the preparation and mitigation phases of disaster management.

**Definition of the Terms**

There have been many different definitions of leadership, but Lenz’s (1993) might be most applicable here. He defines leadership as “diagnosing situations, determining what needs to be done and marshalling collective effort sufficient to achieve a desired future or avert significant problems. It entails the use of power and persuasion to define and determine the changing problems and opportunities of an organization, and the solutions produced and actions are taken by individuals and groups both inside and outside organization to cope with such issues. The purpose of exercising influence in organizational decision-making processes is to foster learning and facilitate change” (p. 154).
Transformational leadership is defined by Northouse (2006) as a process that changes and transforms individuals through values, ethics, standards, and long-range goals. It also involves examining followers’ motives, gratifying needs, and caring for them. Transformational leadership entails an outstanding type of influence that encourages followers to perform beyond that which is expected of them.

Burns (1978) highlights the complex view of transformational leadership. The transformational leader identifies and utilizes a potential follower’s existent need or demand. Moreover, the transforming leader perceives potential intentions in followers, tries to find to satisfy higher needs, and treats the follower as full person. Consequently, transforming leadership is a blend of mutual encouragement that turns followers into leaders and possibly, leaders into moral agents. Burns also states that the transforming leader is one who, though primarily motivated by the search for personal appreciation and recognition, eventually advances the common purpose by understanding the aims of his or her followers.

Emergency management can be defined as the course of developing and executing emergency policies that are pertinent to mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities (Petak, 1985). Mitigation involves risk assessment and preventive measures before an emergency, such as improving building codes before a disaster occurs. Preparedness involves pre-emergency actions taken to respond an emergency, such as preventative plans, training, accumulating supplies, and signing interagency agreements (Kapucu & Van Wart, 2006). Response involves fulfilling instant actions, such as
handling injured and dead victims, and preventing secondary damages. Recovery involves post-disaster efforts to deal with the consequences of the emergency, such as providing basic services (temporary housing, food and clothing), cleaning debris, rebuilding infrastructures, providing psychological therapy, and so on (Kapucu & Van Wart, 2006).

**Purpose of the Study**

The problem of leadership has been identified as the major failure of disaster response activities during and after Hurricane Katrina. Most criticism concentrated upon the lack of leadership at all levels of government, and particularly in the case of FEMA to establish a disaster response and run the relief (Waugh & Streib, 2006).

At the heart of the discussion is the question of what type of leadership would serve FEMA best. To answer that question, we examined the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on FEMA employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness to determine if it is the appropriate type of leadership for FEMA.

**Research Questions**

This study is designed to answer the following questions:

1. In disaster management organizations, what role do leaders play in preparing an effective response and recovery?
2. To what extent do transformational leadership behaviors affect employees’ perception of leadership effectiveness?

3. Which dimensions of transformational leadership have an influence on employees’ perception of leadership effectiveness?

4. How do three dimensions (idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) of transformational leadership influence employees’ perception of leadership effectiveness?

5. How do these three dimensions of transformational leadership correlate?

6. To what extent did perceived leadership effectiveness differ as FEMA went from a separate agency to an agency under the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)?

**Significance of the Study**

In public administration literature, leadership research has been reported insufficiently (Van Wart, 2003). There is also a need for more research on how leaders who encourage innovation, creativity, and adaptability affect public organizations (Fernandez, 2008).

To fill this gap, this study aims to examine the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness in public organizations, particularly FEMA. The study specifically focuses on FEMA as an independent agency and as an agency under the DHS. It also measures transformational leadership behaviors and explores how they relate to public employees’ perceptions of
leadership effectiveness as reported by the 2002, 2006, and 2008 Federal Human Capital Surveys (FHCS).

**Context of the Study**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was previously an independent, executive-branch agency that reported directly to the president. On June 19, 1978, President Jimmy Carter submitted Reorganization Plan Number 3 to Congress in order to establish one federal emergency management organization wherein all emergency preparedness, mitigation, and response activities would be merged. After congressional review and agreement, the Federal Emergency Management Agency was officially instituted by Executive Order 12127 of March 31, 1979. Bullock et al. (2006) states that the initial challenge of this new organization was to combine different programs, operations, policies, and people into a unified operation—a challenge which could only be achieved through extraordinary leadership and common vision. However, because the new organization had no operational guidelines or proponents, it ran into immediate political problems. John Macy, the first FEMA director, tried to integrate the new agency under one umbrella as it was comprised of the following agencies: the National Fire Prevention Control Administration (Department of Commerce), the Federal Insurance Administration (HUD), the Federal Broadcast System (Executive Office of the President), the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency (DOD), the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration (HUD), and the Federal Preparedness Agency (GSA) (Sylves,
2007). In 1982, President Reagan assigned Louis O. Guiffrida as director of FEMA. Due to his background in training and terrorism preparedness at the state government level, Guiffrida’s main concern was on government readiness in case of a nuclear attack (Bullock et al., 2006; Rubin, 2007).

In the early 1980s, FEMA was faced with such disasters as the contamination of Love Canal, the Cuban refugee crisis, and the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island. The agency experienced severe morale problems, lack of leadership, budget issues, and conflicts with state and local partners about its priorities. The responses to Hurricane Hugo and the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, and, three years later, Hurricane Andrew, all put FEMA in the national spotlight. The agency was seen as responding too slowly and relying too much on the decisions of individual states. In 1993, President Clinton designated James L. Witt as the new director of FEMA. Witt was the first agency administrator who had state emergency experience. He initiated comprehensive reforms to update disaster relief and recovery operations, enforced a new emphasis on preparedness and mitigation, and focused agency employees on effective customer service (FEMA, 2010).

The Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 initiated a new focus for the nation’s emergency management: preparedness for a terrorist event. The 1995 Nunn–Lugar legislation raised the question of which agency would take the lead in responding to terrorism. In the late 1990s, a number of different agencies and departments assumed
they had certain roles in terrorism preparedness, which made the question of leadership uncertain. FEMA itself fluctuated on this issue (Bullock et al., 2006).

In 2001, Joe M. Allbaugh was appointed director of FEMA by President George W. Bush. Several months later, the terrorist attack of Sept. 11th took place. Numerous agencies, including FEMA, the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the U.S. National Guard all competed for leadership during the relief operations. Although some initiated coordinated efforts, most of the agencies followed their own strategies. This lack of preparedness and direction caused significant confusion for both state and local governments (FEMA, 2010).

After the attack, President Bush formed the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) and appointed Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge to lead the office. On November 25, 2002, President Bush ratified the Homeland Security Act into law and Ridge became the first agency secretary. In order to increase current programs and institute new ones intended to meet possible terrorist threats, a large amount of funds were allocated from the federal government to state and local governments. In the new formation of DHS, the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate (EP&R) had been established. The FEMA was moved moderately intact into this directorate by retaining many of its original functions (Bullock et al., 2006).

Although the focus on terrorism shifted FEMA’s strategic plans, various natural disasters occurred after 2001— Hurricane Katrina, in particular—that further called into
question the failure of an adequate federal response. In October 2006, the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act was ratified into law. The Act directly addressed what were believed to be the main weaknesses of FEMA and its response to Hurricane Katrina. The Act also made FEMA a separate entity within the DHS. It put limits on how the DHS affects FEMA, and allows the FEMA director to contact the president during emergencies. (Bullock et al., 2006; Rubin, 2007).
Figure 1. The Department of Homeland Security Organizational Chart
Organization of the Study

This dissertation study is organized into five chapters. Each one focuses on the issue as follows: Chapter I has presented the statement of the problem, a definition of terms, the purpose of the study, research questions, the significance and context of the study, and organization of the sub-parts.

Chapter II contains a literature review wherein the leadership concept is described as it pertains to public organizations, how effective leadership energizes the organizational culture, how pursuing transformational leadership strategies stimulate followers’ success, and what transforming behaviors are associated with public employees’ perceptions regarding effectiveness. Furthermore, a comparison between transformational and transactional leader perspectives, which enriches the understanding of leadership effectiveness in organizations, is also provided. Although this study focuses particularly on FEMA leadership, it also discusses the requirements of effective leadership and the reasons for leadership failure in emergency management systems. An analytical model is proposed to show how dimensions of transformational leadership influence perceive leadership effectiveness.

Chapter III outlines the methodology part of the study. It portrays methods and procedures, including design, sampling procedure, data collection strategies, measurement of endogenous and exogenous variables, data resources, and statistical modeling. This study uses FHCS 2002, 2006, and 2008 years’ data to see how transformational leadership behaviors on perceived leadership effectiveness change in
respect to FEMA’s changing structure. Structural equation modeling is used to explain causal relationships and confirmatory factor analysis.

Chapter IV covers the study’s findings, which contain descriptive, correlative, reliability, and confirmatory variable factor analyses. It also delineates how measurement and structural equation models are developed. The study concludes with hypothesis testing and a comparison of different years of leadership effectiveness.

Chapter V discusses the implications, limitations, and conclusions of the study. It provides a summary of findings, explains the study’s limitations and implications, and makes recommendations for future studies.

In summary, this chapter introduced the establishment of the study. The statement of the problem, definition of terms, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and context of the study were explained and the organization of the study chapters were presented.

The following chapter discusses the relevant literature on leadership concepts and in particular, transformational leadership, effective leadership, and the leadership problem in emergency management systems.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is about the literature review of leadership concept. It discusses the leadership in public organizations by explaining how effective leadership can be achieved, how leader and follower interaction can be built, whether transformational leadership behaviors would produce positive impacts on the performance of public employees.

Leadership in Public Organizations

For several decades, the study of leadership in dynamic environments has remained the realm of academics and management intellectuals who de-emphasize the difference between public and private organizations and analyzed leadership chiefly in for-profit agencies. Therefore, most leadership theories and concepts are generic, and do not apply to the environment within a public organization. This lack of research on leadership in public organizations necessitated utilizing resources in the federal government, which contributed to leadership-development information, but did not address the issues of performance management and improvement (Fernandez, 2008).

Previous research shows that although there have been studies on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation, efficiency, and effectiveness; few have analyzed differences in leadership behaviors and effectiveness in public organizations. These
differences may be marked in terms of market powers and disclosures to legislation, legislatures, and civil service rules. They also might impinge on leaders’ discretion in these sectors, which in turn affects leadership performance. To examine these differences, Hooijberg and Choi (2001) researched private and public sector employees to observe whether the basic theories of leadership in the existing literature might illustrate differences. They associated leadership roles with different behaviors of challenging value frameworks to observe which would have a larger impact on perceived effectiveness in different sectors. Their study points out that monitoring and facilitating role have much more of an impact on perceived performance of leadership effectiveness in the public sector.

Gardner (1990) argues that all human institutions are subject to change and because society and organizations are living organisms, change is inevitable. Leaders must realize the reasons why human systems occasionally fail and how the procedures of change may be dynamically established. Rationales for changes in leadership behavior may be to renovate and redefine values, to re-energize systems that are ineffective due to old practices and rigid concepts, to restore abandoned ambitions and create new aims that fit new conditions, to attain new perspectives on solutions to problems, or to promote innovative human dynamics and continuous growth. At this point, it can be said that while transactional leaders accept and work within the confines of existing systems, transformational leaders prefer change and reinvention (Gardner, 1990).
Transformational Leadership

Since the late 1980s, transformational leadership theory has gained popularity in the leadership field. Contrary to earlier theories, transformational leadership theory put an emphasis on emotions and values to demonstrate how a leader can acquire the ability to affect and motivate followers to succeed beyond expectations. The symbolic behavior and role of the leader were also emphasized to make results more meaningful and effective for followers (Yukl, 1999).

Although Burns (1978) formed the transformational leadership paradigm as a new understanding of leadership, Bass and his colleagues (Bass, 1985 and Bass, 1996) have further researched it. They explain transformational leadership mainly as the leader’s effect on followers, and the behavior applied to achieve this effect. Leaders help followers to feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect, which motivate them to do more than they initially expected to do. Leaders also encourage followers to be aware of task outcomes and to supersede their own self-interest for the benefit of the organization.

Yammarino and Bass (1990) describe the transformational leader as one who has a vision of the future that excites and motivates followers, and considers each individual in elaborating differences among them.

The transformational leadership paradigm concentrates more on what the leader achieves, rather than his or her personal characteristics. In chaotic environments, transformational leaders are likely to be more effective because they look for new ways of working, for opportunities in the face of risk, for effective answers to questions, and
are less likely to maintain the status quo. For that reason, they may respond positively to changes in the external environment (Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

Conger (1989) renders behaviors undertaken by effective leaders as actions of perceiving opportunity and generating vision, allowing others to accomplish the vision (intellectual stimulation), communicating a vision that arouses (charisma), endorsing commitment in followers (individualized consideration), and constructing trust through individual commitment (inspirational motivation).

According to Bass (1996), transformational leaders work in ways to accomplish superior outcomes by using one or more of the “Four I’s”:

1. **Individualized consideration**: Diagnoses and promotes the needs of each follower.
2. **Idealized influence**: Becomes a source of esteem by followers, often functioning as role models, increases follower pride, devotion and confidence.
3. **Intellectual stimulation**: Stimulates followers to look at the world from new viewpoints, and questions old assumptions, beliefs, and paradigms.
4. **Inspirational motivation**: Simply articulates an attractive vision and provides meaning and a sense of purpose to what needs to be performed.

Even if Bass (1996) includes “individualized consideration” as one of the dimensions of transformational leadership, Trottier, Van Wart, and Wang (2008) state that it should be placed with transactional cluster as it increases satisfaction and performance in day-to-day settings and reduces turnover. As a result, “individualized
consideration” was not included in the transformational leadership dimensions in this study.

**Idealized Influence**

The term “idealized influence” means simply being influential over ideals. At the highest level of morality, leaders and their followers may dedicate themselves to the best ideals. If someone serves his or her country to the best of his or her abilities, that can be a great motivator to followers (Bass, 1999). It can be stated that transformational leaders demonstrate superior levels of ethical and moral conduct while serving as role models for their supporters. They elevate the importance of common values and beliefs, emphasize the significance of a strong sense of purpose, and underline the worth of achieving a collective sense of the organization’s mission (Bass & Avolio, 1994; 2004; Gozubenli, 2009).

Leaders with idealized influence pose their worries about a problem and the need for its resolution. They progress by generating a “sense of becoming” in the organization. Those followers who identify with the leader move to share the leader’s concerns and increase readiness to recognize the problem as their own (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) articulate why individuals who are superior in emotional intelligence would be more likely to utilize transformational leadership behaviors. These are leaders who recognize and are able to manage their own emotions, demonstrate self-control and delayed gratification, and inspire trust and respect in their
followers. Emotional intelligence also makes leaders more effective in pursuing organizational goals and is consistent with the notion of idealized influence.

**Hypothesis 1: Idealized influence behaviors are positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.**

**Intellectual Stimulation**

Transformational leaders encourage followers’ ideas and assess their efforts to be more creative in solving problems by questioning assumptions, redescribing problems, and redefining old situations in new ways. This stimulation occurs mainly through empowering followers to take the initiative (Riggio & Orr, 2004).

Transformational leaders also challenge followers to generate new ideas which are not completely different from the strategies and ideas of the leaders’ own. They hearten their followers to confront old values, traditions, and beliefs that may be obsolete for today’s problems, articulate threats that the organization may encounter, and offer opportunities for improvement. These leaders posit challenging expectations and support new ideas so followers will accomplish higher performance levels, and simultaneously show compassion in regard to past mistakes. Finally, leaders who intellectually stimulate their followers do not condemn them for having diverse ideas and support them in taking necessary risks (Bass & Avolio, 1994, 2004).
Bass and Avolio (1999) also state that these types of leaders may shift perspectives or unearth hidden assumptions to expose alternative causes that alter the agency’s direction.

Redmond et al. (1993) specifies that when leader behavior increases follower self-efficacy, it results in a higher level of follower creativity in problem-solving situations. Therefore, leader-follower cooperation gains in importance as followers’ desires increase to find mutual solutions to problems. Once this takes place, followers will have increased trust in and attachment to both their leaders and their organization.

Hypothesis 2: Intellectual stimulation behaviors are positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.

**Inspirational Motivation**

Inspirational motivation represents the utilization of vision by transformational leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Conger (1991) mentions that effective leaders are the ingenious craftsmen of their organization's mission. They communicate their missions in ways that create great fundamental demand. Vision is a key leadership behavior for increasing workforce support in organizational augmentation and development. Inspirational motivation measures vision by tracing the rate at which leaders utilize symbols, metaphors, and basic emotional demands to raise awareness and understanding of commonly desired goals (Conger, 1991; Densten, 2002).
Motivation and inspiration are two common values of transformational leaders. Transformational leaders provide significant and challenging work, clearly explain their vision, and communicate the importance of the organization’s mission and objectives to their followers. They speak positively and passionately about the future and express confidence that organizational goals will be achieved. Transformational leaders also stimulate team spirit, generating hope and passion among followers (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994, 2004).

Leaders display inspirational motivation when they encourage employees to do their best and achieve beyond expectations. For that reason, utilization of inspirational motivation helps to increase employees’ feelings of self-reliance, enabling them to optimally carry out their jobs (Snyder & Lopez, 2002).

**Hypothesis 3: Inspirational motivation behaviors are positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.**

**Leadership Effectiveness**

According to Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan (1994), the literature on leadership effectiveness can be categorized into five categories. In the first category, leaders are evaluated on the true performance of their team or organizational unit. In the second, assessments from supervisor subordinates, or peers, are used to evaluate leaders. Third, the effectiveness of leaders is evaluated through interviews, simulations, assessment centers, or leaderless group discussions. Fourth, evaluative criteria by leaders’ own self-
ratings can be used, and lastly, effectiveness can be determined by the low end of a period. If a person is promoted or demoted, it reflects his or her performance.

Leadership effectiveness can also be evaluated in regard to the perceptions of followers. Effective leaders should accomplish four criteria: (a) understand the job-related needs of followers; (b) express those needs to top managers; (c) achieve overall group success; and (d) be conducive to organizational performance (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; 2004). Researchers have suggested that followers respect, admire, and are confident with their leaders when they perceive them to be effective (Bass & Avolio, 1994; 2004).

In organizations, effective leadership offers higher quality and more proficient goods and services; it also offers a sense of cohesiveness, personal development, and higher levels of satisfaction among workers. Furthermore, effective leadership provides a sense of direction, a configuration with the environment, a vigorous mechanism for innovation and creativity, and a means of energizing the organizational culture (Van Wart, 2003).

Conger (1989) presents the behaviors of effective leaders as perceiving opportunity and generating vision, allocating others to accomplish this vision (intellectual stimulation), communicating a vision that arouses (charisma), supporting commitment in followers, and building trust through individual commitment (inspirational motivation).

**Hypothesis 4:** Idealized Influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation correlate with each other.
Transformational Leaders vs. Transactional Leaders

Bass (1996) proposes that there must be two separations in leadership philosophy: transformational and transactional. The transactional leader keeps the power to perform specific tasks and rewards or punishes for the sake of the team’s performance. This leader holds the power to direct the group and the group concurs to follow his lead to achieve a preset goal in exchange for something else. This leader also holds the power to assess, correct, and educate followers in raising productivity to the desired level and rewards effectiveness to achieve optimal outcomes.

The transformational leader encourages his team to become effective and efficient. Communication is key in accomplishing goals to reach optimum outcomes by focusing the group. The leader uses the chain of command to finalize the job and focuses on the big picture, along with those who are responsible for task details. The leader is always seeking new ideas that move the organization to achieve its vision (Burns, 1978).

On the other hand, Bass (1985) considers both the transformational and transactional leadership concepts as inseparable parts of one theory rather than distinct from each other. The two concepts might be related somewhat, he speculates, each in the attainment of predetermined goals and objectives. From this perspective, the transformational leadership style should be coordinated with the transactional style in some settings. If that does not happen, says Bass, the deficiency of transactional method
between leaders and followers may result in the breakdown of transformational style (Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987).

Shivers-Blackwell (2006) states that a difference between transactional and transformational leader is that, “while an ordinary transactional leader, also defined as a ‘mechanistic’ leader, is merely to be more effective in predictable and more stable environments, a transformational leader, also characterized as ‘organic’ leader, will be more effective for organizations operating in unpredictable or even hostile environments” (p. 29).

Avolio and Bass (1988) write that the transactional leader may prefer to simplify the job structure, proposing that the right way to do things is a way that sustains dependence on the leader for preferred problem solutions. The transformational leader, alternatively, may offer a new strategy or vision to deal with a problem, giving followers control in problem solving.

Some scholars (Waldman, Bass, and Einstein, 1987) discern that the difference between the two types of leaders is that the transactional leader is obsessed with authoritarian and provisional reward-exchanges. These scholars also think that exchange processes are ways of obtaining desired behaviors.

For his part, Burns (1978) states that the difference between transformational and transactional leadership is what leaders and followers provide one another. “Transforming leadership . . . occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and
morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose. Transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. This results in followers identifying with the needs of the leader” (p. 20).

Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999) claim that in cases of external distress, transformational leaders can reinvent organizational value commitments, rearrange challenging interests and power discrepancies, and build noteworthy capacity drawing on existing structures and practices to generate organizational innovations.
Table 1. Summary Table Comparing/Contrasting the Two Leader Perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transactional Leader</strong></th>
<th><strong>Transformational Leader</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the status quo</td>
<td>Leader of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplifies the job structure. Proposes to do things in such a way that sustains dependence on him/her for preferred problem solutions.</td>
<td>Offers a new strategy or vision to deal with a problem. Endows the follower’s control in problem solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a mechanistic leader, he/she is merely more effective in predictable and more stable environments.</td>
<td>As organic leader, he/she will be more effective for organizations operating in unpredictable or even hostile environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps the power. Rewards or punishes for the sake of the team’s performance.</td>
<td>Encourages the group to become effective and efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directs the group which then concurs to follow the leader to achieve a preset goal in exchange for something else.</td>
<td>Seeks new ideas that move the organization to achieve its vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses, corrects, and educates followers in terms of raising productivity to the desired level and rewarding effectiveness to reach optimum outcomes.</td>
<td>Communicates with and focuses on the group for goal accomplishment to reach optimum outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional Leader</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transformational Leader</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates followers by appealing to their own self-interest (for example, pay, promotion, etc.).</td>
<td>Enhances follower confidence and moves them increasingly from self-interested concerns to concerns for accomplishment and growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on social and economic exchanges between leaders and followers, using contingent rewards and administrative actions to reinforce positive and reform negative behaviors.</td>
<td>Focuses on organizational objectives and organizational change by disseminating new values and seeking alternatives to existing arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sees leader-follower relationship as needs-and-services exchange that satisfies his or her independent objectives.</td>
<td>Offers a purpose that transcends short-term goals and focuses on higher-order intrinsic needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports structures and systems that emphasize outcomes.</td>
<td>Can reinvent organizational value commitments, rearrange challenging interests and power discrepancies, and build noteworthy capacity drawing on existing structures and practices to generate organizational innovations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders and followers not bound together in mutual pursuit of higher purpose.</td>
<td>Leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 summarizes comparing/contrasting characteristics of the two leadership perspectives. Transactional leaders are characterized as leaders of the status quo. They keep the power, direct the employees without giving them any opportunities in the decision-making process, and simplify the job. They are most successful in predictable and stable environments which do not require innovation, change, or creativity. On the other hand, transformational leaders are characterized as leaders of change. They encourage employees to be effective and efficient, seek out new ideas to solve problems, and offer novel strategies to accomplish the job. These leaders are most effective in organizations operating in unpredictable or even hostile environments.

**Leadership in Emergency Management Systems**

In the United States, the discipline of emergency management has widened and contracted in response to events, the desires of Congress, and leadership styles. Moreover, emergency management has also become an important role of the government. The Constitution delegates individual states with public health and safety liability and entrusts the federal government to a secondary, supplementary role. This role was only to be expanded when state, local, or individual organizations were overwhelmed (Bullock et al., 2006).

The leadership strategy needed for disasters may well be counterintuitive. Those situations may be better managed by an affiliative, open, and democratic approach. An authoritarian reaction would definitely be quicker and more consistent, but would need insight and vision that may be obtainable to only a select few. In addition, flexibility must be a key requirement for leaders in disastrous events and hierarchical decision-making is neither flexible nor efficient in quickly changing circumstances (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

According to Sashlin (1992), leadership has to be based more on information access and management skills than on technical skills. The disaster manager of the future may not need to know much about operational skills on the front line. However, that manager must know what information is needed, who should have it, how to access it rapidly, and how it can be circulated promptly.

Wise (2006) states that even if command and control structures are important, the DHS needs to develop more flexible and agile processes that can accommodate changing circumstances. He adds that more adaptive management, which encourages information sharing and collaboration, would promote organizational learning and enhance adaptation and creativeness.

Sashlin (1992) says that a paradigm shift took place and by the mid-1990s, the focus of disaster response was replaced with mitigation. The federal role became one of saving people, minimizing risks, and preparing for and responding to disasters. The
traditional role of disaster response had become impractical; it was simply taking too long to organize and perform a rescue. Proactive efforts, such as pre-positioning material close to predictable disaster areas, were shifted to support state and local efforts to try to prevent the type of delays that occurred during responses to Hurricane Hugo in 1989 and Hurricane Andrew in 1992. Those disasters also triggered an immediate federal response to the most helpless populations. Partnerships were then between state and local agencies, and the capabilities of first and second responders, particularly at the local level were expanded.

In the field of emergency management, it is very difficult to evaluate performance. Although emergency managers use simulation scenarios to prepare organizations for natural and man-made disasters, it is almost impossible to evaluate the effectiveness of organizational response outcomes. For that reason, emergency managers must assess their organizations in terms of meeting the requirements of the jurisdiction before a disaster strikes (McGuire & Sylvia, 2009).

**Recognition of the Leadership Problem in Emergency Management Systems**

Schneider (2005) illustrates that administrative specialization and expertise is a characteristic of successful bureaucratic organizations. For example, the FEMA directors during the Bush Administration, Joe Allbaugh (2001-2003) and Michael Brown (2003-2005), had no prior experience in disaster response and relief operations. Schneider mentions that a review of speeches given by Michael Chertoff, the Secretary of DHS, and
Brown, during Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath in 2005, reveals a distinct lack of decisiveness and strong leadership.

Another characteristic of a successful bureaucratic organization is the ability to focus on clearly affirmed mission objectives. After the events of 9/11, FEMA’s focus shifted from disasters to anti-terrorism. A statement made by FEMA leaders at this time illustrates this shift in focus. After structural changes in 2003, FEMA became a small part of the DHS, with much broader objectives, the agency’s focus again shifted: to three-in-four counterterrorism and one-in-four natural disaster preparedness and response activities (Schneider, 2005).

The House Select Committee for Hurricane Katrina stated that the most significant failure of the poor response to Hurricane Katrina was a failure of leadership. The Committee report also indicated that FEMA and DHS officials could not carry out the requirements of existing disaster plans. Ultimately, officials responded to the charges, saying that plans were not implemented in time and were ineffective for the current conditions (Waugh & Streib, 2006).

Tierney, Lindell, and Perry (2001) state that federal disaster preparedness is influenced and limited not only by institutional power differentials, but also by the nature of our intergovernmental system. Derived from analyses by researchers and agencies such as the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO), Waugh (1988) identified a number of factors that have made implementation of federal disaster preparedness initiatives difficult. Besides intergovernmental complexity, other obstacles include a lack of
leadership at the federal level—due in part to the weak position held by FEMA—poor federal interagency cooperation, and unclear goals and objectives. In addition, implementing the technical aspects of preparedness actions as they are based on detailed hazard analyses, insufficient resources, and a lack of overall federal disaster preparedness efforts are also difficulties to overcome.

Jenkins (2006) states that Hurricane Katrina raised questions about the nation’s preparedness to respond effectively to catastrophic disasters. Effective emergency preparedness is a job that is never done and requires commitment and leadership to its ever-changing conditions.

Johnson (2001) proposes that leaders should not spell out to followers exactly what to do and when to do it. They should ensure that simplicity exists within the organization’s systems as to make it obvious what to do. People can then make rational decisions in chaotic situations, and the organization will not fall into incoherence.

Predetermined efforts to bring parts of organizations together emphasize inter-organizational planning, as opposed to reorganizing formal organizations to manage all prospective contingencies. This does not mean that the structure of government organizations is irrelevant. From a network perspective, emphasis placed on structuring organization and organizational planning can help the government then set the stage for other agencies to interact with the greater inter-organizational field to achieve common goals (Wise, 1990).
The 2002 GAO report, “Management Challenges Facing Federal Leadership in Homeland Security,” acknowledges that execution of a national strategy will rely on illuminating federal agency and nonfederal collaborator responsibilities as well as performance objectives. This strategy designates the DHS as the hub for coordinating national homeland security operations. Many preparations depend on DHS leadership, however the strategy does not include tasks for the period prior to the DHS’s actions. If the strategy included assigning a federal lead agency for each preparedness attempt below the department level, even for those attempts that require crosscutting coordination, it would better illustrate agency roles.

Authority is essential in inter-organizational relations. Each organization or network has its own specific goals and when they are called upon to perform a common task, organization goals can conflict. Naturally, each organization wishes to follow their desired goals, but to accomplish a common task those goals must be relinquished (Milward, 1982). In addition, mandated authority is essential to tighter coordination between units and can help facilitate the creation of inter-organizational councils.

The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (2002) states that 9/11 highlighted the need for health care institutions to work together to increase awareness about the need for effective disaster management planning. Coordinated efforts between health care institutions and local, regional, state, and federal organizations are essential to success. A particular organization’s disaster management plan may state its own limited role effectively but they must also be ready to deal with
unforeseen situations, such as no longer being able to accept extra care beneficiaries, or when staff cannot get to work because roads are closed.

Johnson (2002) mentions one of the lessons learned about disaster preparedness is to choose the leadership of the hospital’s disaster committee carefully to better expedite disaster preparedness plans. A calm, influential, results-oriented, action-oriented person with complete authority to get the job done must lead the committee. Other members of the disaster leadership team should be able to work collectively to make accurate, quick, and wise decisions under difficult circumstances. In addition, a disaster committee should also include individuals whose expertise and practical skills are particularly valuable, such as those in maintenance (Johnson, 2001).

Nates and Moyer (2005) informs that when one looks at the big picture of recent disasters, the poor result is not a lack of knowledge, but inactivity and insufficient implementation of the required measures to prevent, hold, or mitigate the impact of natural disasters on the people exposed. The authors also believe that without swift and effective modifications to current inadequate emergency responses, it is inevitable that the same mistakes will be made in future responses.

In an official letter to President Bush, Townsend states that “despite all we do, however, Hurricane Katrina was a deadly reminder that we can and must do better, and we will. This is the first and foremost lesson we learned from the death and devastation caused by our country’s most destructive natural disaster: No matter how prepared, we must work every day to improve” (Townsend, 2006: 5). The report also identifies 17
critical challenges such as leadership, national preparedness, communications, public safety and security, foreign assistance, training exercises and lessons learned, etc.

In summary, the literature reveals that leadership behaviors can affect the way their organizations perform and have an impact on perceived leadership effectiveness in public agencies. Transformational leadership behaviors stimulate leaders to renovate and recreate values, to generate effective solutions to problems under pressure, to promote the discharge of human dynamics, and to renew organizational systems.

**Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Analytical Model**

The preceding literature review suggests that three key dimensions of transformational leadership have a significant influence on perceived leadership effectiveness: idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. Each of these constructs is not easy to observe directly, therefore indicator variables derived from literature and employed for measurement.

Another aspect of transformational leadership theory explains how leaders develop a sense of commitment among followers. The theory elucidates a connection between leader and follower that results in improved performance and accomplishments for the larger group, unit, and organization (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transformational leadership practices transcend the attempts of leaders who want to satisfy followers’ current needs during transactions or exchanges using contingent-reward behavior. Transformational leaders also stimulate heightened awareness, enhance confidence, and
move followers from concerns for self-existence to concerns for group accomplishments and growth. Transformational leaders motivate their followers to the point where followers are able to take on leadership roles and achieve beyond recognized standards (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

The proposed analytical model of perceived transformational leadership effectiveness based on the literature review is shown below. It indicates that each dimension of transformational leadership behaviors—idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation—relates to and influences perceived leadership effectiveness.

![Proposed Analytical Model of Perceived Performance of Leadership Effectiveness.](image)

This chapter, in general, focused on the leadership concept in public organizations, and particularly upon effective leadership in terms of stimulating followers’ success and generating a positive influence on the perceptions of leadership effectiveness. Additionally, a comparison between transformational and transactional
leaders’ perspectives helped to enhance the understanding of leadership effectiveness in organizations. Moreover, the requirements of effective leadership and the reasons behind leadership problem are manifested within emergency management organizations.

In the next chapter, methodology for the study is discussed through methodological design, sampling procedure, data collection strategies, data resources, and statistical modeling.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This chapter delineates the methods and procedures used in the study, includes design, sampling, data resources, data collection, measurement of variables, and statistical modeling. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to indicate causal relationships and confirmatory factor analysis.

A review of the pertinent literature suggests transformational leadership behaviors have direct causal relationships with perceived leadership effectiveness. Predictor variables are calculated by empirically sustained indicators. In this study, a model was designed to test the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational stimulation) and perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA. Data were obtained from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM). The Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) was used to explore the conditions that create and define high-performance organizations. Hypotheses will be examined using the AMOS 16 for confirmatory factor analysis. Each measurement model will be tested according to goodness-of-fit (GOF) scores. Measurement models with a satisfactory GOF score will be combined to create a generic perceived leadership effectiveness structural equation mode. The generic model will be adjusted to modification index (MI) results to identify the specification sources and fit of the data. After correlating measurement errors, a revised perceived leadership effectiveness model
will be presented. Testing the model will demonstrate how the constructed model explains perceived leadership effectiveness with transformational leadership behaviors. If the constructed model generates satisfactory model fitness scores (lower than 4), the hypothesized model will be confirmed.

To answer the question, “to what extent did perceived leadership effectiveness differ when FEMA was independent or within DHS”, the study combined FHCS information (from 2002, 2006, and 2008) into three-year data with equality constraints applied. A yearly variable was included (coded 1, 2, and 3) as a predictor for the perceived effectiveness of leadership. In 2002, FEMA was an independent agency and when the 2006 and 2008 data were gathered FEMA was an organization under the DHS. The revised perceived leadership effectiveness SEM model will be retested by multiple group analysis to find out whether a difference exists between transformational leadership behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.

**Study Variables**

In this study, perceived leadership effectiveness, as an endogenous latent construct, is being replicated by three exogenous constructs of the transformational leadership’s dimensions—idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation—that reflects FEMA employees’ perceptions about how their leaders perform (see Appendix E in p.175).
Although FHCSs contain demographic and other organizational characteristics of survey participants, that data is not consistent in all versions of survey settings. For instance, in FHCS-2002, there were three characteristics: supervisory status, gender, and race. In FHCS-2006 and FHCS-2008, 11 characteristics were the same: location of work, supervisory status, gender, ethnicity, race, age group, pay category, federal tenure, agency tenure, considering leaving, and planning retirement. The three-year data is utilized in this study to determine possible control variables and whether they match. Only three of them are matched—supervisory status, gender, and race—but the category of supervisory status and race was different in FHCS-2002 than in FHCS-2006 and FHCS-2008. Hence, combining that category in the three-year data might not be useful. On the other hand, although the gender variable was present in FCHS-2002, 92 percent of gender values in FHCS-2008 and 79 percent of gender values in FHCS-2006 were missing. As a result, gender is not considered to be a control variable. Overall, due to this type of missing or inconsistent information, no control variable is used to explain the moderating effects of demographics and other organizational characteristics on perceived leadership effectiveness in this study. (Codebooks of FHCS-2002, FHCS-2006, and FHCS-2008 can be found in Appendix II, Appendix III, and Appendix IV).

**Perceived Leadership Effectiveness**

Perceived leadership effectiveness is an endogenous latent construct in this study. It is used to examine the revised perceived leadership effectiveness model to learn what
behaviors of leaders are perceived to be effective by employees in FEMA. Dhar and Mishra (2001) suggest that one of the important indicators of leadership effectiveness is follower attitudes to the leader. This is associated with gratifying followers’ needs and anticipations, generating respect and esteem for the leader, and increasing follower involvement.

Perceived leadership effectiveness is also associated with a leader’s success, performance, and his or her ability to serve as a role model (Hooijberg & Choi, 2001). In this study, perceived leadership effectiveness will determine the followers’ level of respect and how they perceive their leader’s performance. Perceived leadership effectiveness, as a latent construct, is measured by four statements; “My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues (PLE-1)”; “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills (PLE-2)”; “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year (PLE-3)”; and “My talents are used well in the workplace (PLE-4).”

**Idealized Influence**

Transformational leaders are seen as role models by their followers. Leaders are accepted, esteemed, and trusted. Followers identify with them and seek to imitate them. These leaders almost always put the needs of others over personal needs, and he or she shares risks with followers. The leader can be relied upon to do the right thing and displays superior standards of ethical and moral conduct (Bass and Avolio, 1994).
Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) argue that superior emotional intelligence predisposes an individual to exhibit transformational leadership behaviors. For example, leaders who recognize and are able to manage their own emotions, who demonstrate self-control and delayed gratification, and who could be a role model for their followers. Emotional intelligence also makes leaders more effective in pursuing organizational goals, which is consistent with the notion of idealized influence.

In this study, idealized influence, as an exogenous construct, is represented by three survey items which determine the idealized-influence dimension of transformational leadership: “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives”; “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile”; and “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?”

**Intellectual Stimulation**

Transformational leaders stimulate their followers’ attempts to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions and re-evaluating previous experiences. Followers are integrated into the problem-solving process, encouraged to be creative, and to try new approaches. They are not criticized when their ideas differ from the leader’s ideas (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

When leader behavior increases follower self-efficacy it results in a higher level of follower creativity in problem-solving situations. Therefore, leader-follower
cooperation is important in terms of increasing followers’ belief and willingness to find mutual solutions to problems. Once self-efficacy is formed, followers will begin to trust their leaders, which increase their attachment to both their leaders and the organization (Redmond et al., 1993).

In this study, intellectual stimulation, as an exogenous construct, is represented by three items: “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development”; “How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?” and “Creativity and innovation are rewarded.”

**Inspirational Motivation**

Transformational leaders motivate and inspire those around them by offering meaning to followers’ effort. Team spirit, enthusiasm, and optimism are encouraged. The leader takes followers through a process of visualizing desirable future circumstances. He or she expresses expectations that followers desire to meet and display a commitment to goals and the collective vision (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

Leaders show inspirational motivation when they employees and work teams are encouraged to do their best and surpass their own expectations. Inspirational motivation also increases employees’ feelings of self-reliance and self-efficacy, and enables them to be optimally effective in their work (Snyder & Lopez, 2002).

In this study, inspirational motivation as an exogenous construct is represented by three items: “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work
processes”; “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce”; and “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?”

**Design of the Study**

The FHCS is a tool that measures employees' perceptions of whether, and to what extent, conditions that defines successful organizations are present in their agencies. The first survey took place in 2002; it was repeated in 2004, 2006 and 2008. The survey:

- Provides broad indicators of how well the federal government administers its human resources management systems.
- Serves as an OPM tool to evaluate individual agencies and their development toward "green" status on the Strategic Management of Human Capital initiative under the President's Management Agenda.
- Gives top managers critical information to answer the question: What can I do to make my agency work better? (OPM, 2009).

**Data Resources**

Starting in 2002, the OPM has been conducting a FHCS every two years to evaluate and determine characteristics of high-performance organizations. The FHCS was administered to full-time, permanent employees of the major agencies represented on the
President's Management Council (PMC) and small/independent agencies that accepted an invitation to participate (OPM, 2009).

Data from 2002 and later have almost identical characteristics which help to facilitate comparison. This study utilizes data from 2002, 2006, and 2008 for multiple group analysis. Data from FHCS 2004 was not taken into consideration, as FEMA was not specifically mentioned as a sub-unit under the DHS.

The FHCS-2002 survey was electronically distributed to a stratified random sample of 208,424 federal employees in 24 agencies between May and August 2002. Fifty-one percent of the surveyees (106,742) responded to the survey (OPM, 2009). There were 632 FEMA employees who participated in the survey.

The FHCS 2006 survey was conducted electronically. Paper versions of the survey were provided to surveyees who did not have access to the Internet. The response rate from the 390,657 employees who received the survey and the 221,479 who completed it was 57 percent (OPM, 2009). There were 683 FEMA employees who participated in the survey.

The FHCS-2008 survey was also conducted electronically. The response rate from the 417,128 employees who received the survey and the 212,223 who completed it was 51 percent (OPM, 2009). There were 541 FEMA employees who participated in the survey.

From each year’s dataset, FEMA respondents were identified and a new dataset was created exclusively for the agency. Subsequently, the new FEMA-2002, 2006, and
2008 datasets were combined into pooled three-year data with a sample size of 1, 856, which was used for this study.

The surveys’ data were obtained and converted to an SPSS© file. String data were converted to numerical data. Recoding of [0] was used instead of [X] for the option of “do not know”. Missing values have been replaced with the mode value that occurs most frequently in each variable.

In November 2009, the University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB) determined that this study is not a human research, and approved the use of this dataset. Since this is a public access database, the UCF IRB granted approval in an exempt review. A copy of this approval can be found in Appendix A.

**Sampling**

The survey was conducted online to federal employees notified by email of their selection for the sample. Electronic administration simplified the distribution, completion, and collection of the survey. To promote higher response rates, OPM extended survey deadlines and mailed numerous follow-up letters to the surveyees. Sampled employees could email the OPM help center for assistance with any questions. A toll-free number was also provided for survey assistance. OPM also gave agencies a model of communications and helped them develop an internal communication plan (OPM, 2009).
The survey was electronically distributed to government employees in federal agencies. Study data came from FEMA employees and others in supervisory positions. The unit of analysis is every single FEMA employee. The agency is analyzed as the leading organization of all disaster management activities in the U.S. The analysis contains perceptions of federal FEMA employees to help determine how well their leaders perform in their positions.

Measurement of the study variables and their reliability and validity

Perceived leadership effectiveness, as an endogenous latent construct, is measured by answers at ordinal levels. “My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues”; “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills”; “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year”; and “My talents are well used in the workplace”. Responses are categorized using a 5-point Likert Scale and ranged from, “strongly disagree” (coded 1), “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item.

Idealized influence, as an exogenous construct, is represented by a combination score from three items; “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives”; “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile”; and “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?” Responses are
categorized using a 5-point Likert Scale and range from, “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item.

Intellectual stimulation as an exogenous construct is represented by a combination score from three items; “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development”; “How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?” and “Creativity and innovation are rewarded.” Responses are categorized using a 5-point Likert Scale and range from, “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item.

Inspirational motivation as an exogenous construct is represented by a combination score from three items; “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes”; “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce”; and “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?” Responses are categorized by using a 5-point Likert Scale and range from, “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item.

In SEM, confirmatory factor analysis of latent constructs will be established and validated for their construct validity. The measurement model will be fitted to the data and then further revised until the GOF scores reach a reasonable level.

The consistency of the measuring instrument has been tested for several years and considered reasonably reliable. Both the responses and questions were very understandable and there was no need for interpretation.
Statistical Modeling

SEM was used as the main research statistical-analysis tool. “SEM is a class of methodologies that seeks to represent hypotheses about summary statistics derived from empirical measurements in terms of a smaller number of structural parameters defined by a hypothesized underlying model,” (Kaplan, 2008, p.1). SEM also defines the causal relationships among exogenous latent variables factored from observed variables in the measurement model, in addition to the effects of the exogenous variables (Wan, 1995).

SEM integrates the measurement models with the structural models. In these circumstances, the measurement model illustrates which observed variables define a latent construct; and the structural model explains relationships between latent constructs (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1992). While SEM can be used for different applications, this studied used causal modeling and confirmatory factor analysis.

Confirmatory factor analysis will be utilized to estimate the validity of each proposed measurement model for the latent construct (Byrne, 2001). “Confirmatory factor analysis attempts to explain the variation and covariation in a set of observed variables in terms of a set of theoretical, unobserved variables. The observed variables are conceptualized as linear functions of one or more factors. These factors can be either common (latent) factors which may directly affect more than one of the observed variables, or unique (measurement error) factors, which may directly affect only one observed variable,” (Long, 1983, p.22).
After confirmatory factor analysis substantiates the model, a covariance structure will be used to examine the latent construct measurement models and SEM. This process will specify how strongly the exogenous variables affect perceived leadership effectiveness.

Bass (1999) informs that in most factor studies, three conceptually discernible factors may emerge: charisma inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. As the transformational factors are significantly intercorrelated, an exclusive transformational factor, which can combine them, may gratify the requirements for parsimony in some research.

“The multicollinearity in the factors of transformational leadership presents a statistical problem even as we cross cultures, but the factorial structure remains. Mean scores on the factors may vary and some behaviors may become inappropriate. For instance, in Japan, contingent reward is more implicit than explicit. Nevertheless, the overall factor structure continues to provide a meaningful framework,” (Bass, 1999, p.20).

It has also been argued that measuring effects and behaviors is different, but may cause high correlation. For instance, when evaluating idealized influence, it is critical that some follower attributions be gained as idealized influence engages extraordinariness in the minds of the perceiver. Measuring the scale of attributes and behaviors of idealized influence would be also being highly correlated (Bass & Avolio, 1993).
In order to prevent the possible statistical problem of multicollinearity among the indicators of transformational leadership dimensions, each dimension of transformational leadership is represented as an exogenous latent construct. Instead of using the values of each indicator of each dimension, a new variable is generated with the dimension’s name and the average score of those three indicators. These new variables (IdeaInfl, IntelStimu, and InspMotiv) are assigned to each specific exogenous latent construct. Each exogenous latent construct is also combined with double-headed arrows to measure the correlational (symmetric) relationship among the transformational leadership dimensions.

Based on an extensive literature review of empirical findings, this study attempts to measure four latent constructs: the endogenous variable of perceived leadership effectiveness, and the exogenous variable of idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. A measurement model for perceived leadership effectiveness was developed and validated by confirmatory factor analysis.
As shown in Figure 3, Perceived Leadership Effectiveness was measured by four indicators, which was based on how employees perceive their leaders in terms of being effective in their positions.
Figure 4. Perceived Leadership Effectiveness SEM Model
Figure 4 shows the generic model of Perceived Leadership Effectiveness. The endogenous latent construct of perceived leadership effectiveness is explained by three exogenous latent constructs of transformational leadership dimensions.

In summary, this chapter provided details about the methodology of the study. While design, sampling procedure, data collection strategies, measurement of variables, data resources, and statistical modeling were presented, formation of the perceived leadership effectiveness measurement model and generic structural equation model were developed in order to clarify causal relationships among latent constructs.
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

This chapter describes the findings of the study and includes descriptive statistics, correlations, confirmatory factor analysis, reliability analysis, structural equation modeling, and hypothesis-testing parts. There is discussion on comparisons between years to determine differences in the variances on perceived leadership effectiveness among the datasets.

Descriptive Statistics

The three-year FHCS data consisted of 1856 FEMA-employee subjects who work in positions of executive, manager, supervisor, non-supervisor, or team leader. Raykov and Marcoulides (2006) specify that sample size plays a significant role in virtually each statistical technique applied in empirical research. Even if there is a common agreement among researchers that the larger the sample size relative to the population the more accurate the parameter estimates, there is not agreement as to what comprises “large”, owing to the complexity of this matter. A simplified effort to solve this issue would be to have a sample size more than ten times of the number of model parameters (Hu, Bentler, & Kano, 1992; Raykov & Marcoulides, 2006).

In order to answer the research question of “to what extent does perceived leadership effectiveness differs when FEMA is independent or within DHS,” the
Perceived Leadership Effectiveness

Perceived leadership effectiveness, as an endogenous latent construct, is measured by answers to questions at ordinal levels: “My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues (PLE-1)”; “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills, (PLE-2)”; “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year (PLE-3),”; and “My talents are used well in the workplace (PLE-4)”. Responses are categorized by using a 5-point Likert Scale and range from “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item.
Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness (three-year-data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLE-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>12.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>42.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>14.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>18.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>43.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>16.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>23.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>39.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 2, the data reveals that the majority of respondents agree that they perceive their leaders effective in their positions. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level on how employees see their leaders.

*Indicator 1:* “*My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues (PLE-1).*”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they received support on work and family issues from their supervisor was 1,403. Two hundred and two employees, or 12.88% disagreed or strongly disagreed; 234 or 12.61% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors were perceived as effective in supporting employees’ needs to balance work and family issues in their organizations.
Indicator 2: “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills (PLE-2).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they were provided with opportunities from their supervisors/team leaders was 1,079, or 58.14% of all respondents. Four hundred nineteen employees, or 22.57% of all respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed; 339 or 18.27% of all respondents did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA supervisors/team leaders were perceived as effective in providing with opportunities for employees to demonstrate their leadership skills in their organizations.

Indicator 3: “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year (PLE-3).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that their skill level improved in the past year is 986, or 53.12% of all respondents. Four hundred eleven employees, or 22.15% of all respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed; 440 or 23.71% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees improve their leadership skills in the past year.

Indicator 4: “My talents are used well in the workplace (PLE-4).”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their talents were used well in the work is 1,026, or 55.28% of all respondents. Five hundred thirty-three employees, or 28.72% of all respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed; 292 or
15.73% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees use their talents well in their workplace.
Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLE-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(My supervisor supports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my need to balance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work and family issues.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>32.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supervisors/team leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my work unit provide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees with the</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities to demonstrate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>44.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their leadership skills.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The skill level in my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit has improved in the</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past year.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>41.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 3, the FHCS-2002 data disclosed that the majority of respondents agreed that their leaders are effective in their positions. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1:** “My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues (PLE-1).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they were supported was 349, or 55.22% of all respondents. One hundred seventy-four employees, or 27.54% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 105 respondents, or 9.97% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors effectively supported employees’ needs on balancing work and family issues in their organizations in 2002.

**Indicator 2:** “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills (PLE-2).”
The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they were provided with opportunities was 1,079, or 58.14% of all respondents. Four hundred and nineteen employees, 22.57% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 394 respondents, or 18.27% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA supervisors/team leaders were perceived as effective in providing leadership opportunities for employees their organizations in 2002.

Indicator 3: “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year (PLE-3).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that their skill level had improved was 353, or 55.86% of all respondents. Two hundred fifty-four employees, or 24.37% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 125 respondents, or 19.78% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees to improve their leadership.

Indicator 4: “My talents are used well in the workplace (PLE-4),”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their talents were used well in the work is 350, or 55.38% of all respondents. Two hundred and six, or 32.60% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 74 respondents, or 11.71% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees to use their talents well in their workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLE-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>40.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>20.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>42.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>36.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-4 (My talents are used well in the workplace.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4, the FHCS-2006 data revealed that the majority of respondents agree that they identify their leaders as effective in their positions. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1:** “My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues (PLE-1),”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they received support from their supervisor was 517, or 75.70% of all respondents. Sixty-four employees, or 9.37% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 95 respondents, or 13.91% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors were recognized as effective in supporting employees’ needs to balance work and family issues in their organizations.

**Indicator 2:** “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills (PLE-2).”
The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they were provided with opportunities was 399, or 58.42% of all respondents. One hundred thirty-five, or 19.76% of all respondents, disagreed; 141 respondents, or 20.64% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors/team leaders were as perceived as effective in providing opportunities for employees to demonstrate their leadership skills in their organizations.

Indicator 3: “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year (PLE-3).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that their skill level had improved in their work unit in the past year was 332, or 48.61% of all respondents. One hundred fifty-one employees, or 22.11% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 189 respondents, or 27.67% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees improve their skill levels in their work units.

Indicator 4: “My talents are used well in the workplace (PLE-4).”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their talents were used well is 365, or 53.44% of all respondents. One hundred and ninety employees, or 27.82% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 125 respondents, or 18.30% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA were perceived as effective in helping employees use their talents well in their workplace.
Table 5. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness (2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLE-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>43.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>31.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>44.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>39.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-4 (My talents are used well in the workplace.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>43.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 5, the FHCS-2008 data disclosed that the majority of respondents agree that they identify their leaders as effective in their positions. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1:** “My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues (PLE-1).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they received this support is 410, or 75.78% of all respondents. Fifty-five employees, or 10.17% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 76 respondents, or 14.05% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors were identified as effective in supporting employees’ needs to balance work and family issues in their organizations.

**Indicator 2:** “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills (PLE-2).”
The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that they were provided with opportunities from their supervisors/team leaders was 331, or 61.19% of all respondents. One hundred and ten employees, or 20.33% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 93 respondents, or 17.19% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors/team leaders were perceived as effective in providing opportunities for employees to demonstrate their leadership skills in their organizations.

Indicator 3: “The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year (PLE-3).”

The total number of employees who agreed or strongly agreed that their skill level had improved in the past year was 301, or 55.64% of all respondents. One hundred and six employees, or 19.59% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 126 respondents, or 23.29% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees improve their skill level in their work units.

Indicator 4: “My talents are used well in the workplace (PLE-4).”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their talents were used well was 311, or 57.49% of all respondents. One hundred thirty-seven employees, or 25.33% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 93 respondents, or 17.19% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show
that FEMA leaders were perceived as effective in helping employees to use their talents well in their workplace.

**Idealized Influence**

Idealized influence as an exogenous construct is represented with a score combination of three statements: “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives”; “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile”; and “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?” Two indicators’ responses are categorized using a 5-point Likert Scale that ranges from “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item and one indicator’s response is categorized by using a 5-point Likert Scale from “very dissatisfied” (coded 1), to “very satisfied” (coded 5).
Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Idealized Influence (three-year data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>16.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>24.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>39.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with my supervisor/ team leader about my performance are worthwhile.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>22.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>38.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>26.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>22.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 6, the three-year data reveals that the majority of respondents are agreed or satisfied that they see their leaders as sources of esteem and role models that increases employees’ pride, devotion and confidence. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

Indicator 1: “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their managers examined and assessed the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives were 886, or 47.74% of all respondents. Four hundred seventy-three employees, or 24.41% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 456 respondents, or 24.57% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA managers were viewed as ideally influential on employees in examining and assessing the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

Indicator 2: “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.”

The total numbers of respondents who agree or strongly agree that discussions with their supervisors/team leaders about their performance are worthwhile were 958, or 51.61% of all respondents. Four hundred sixty-seven employees, or 25.17% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 420 respondents, or 22.63% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as ideally influential on employees in discussing their performance.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the information they receive from management on what's going on in their organization was 708, or 38.15% of all respondents. Seven hundred twenty-eight employees, or 39.22% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 420 respondents, or 22.63% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that the FEMA management was not seen as ideally influential on employees with information on what's going on in their organization.
Table 7. The Frequency and Percentage Distributions for the Idealized Influence (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>47.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>632</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with my supervisor/ team leader about my performance are worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>632</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>27.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>20.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to Table 7, the FHCS-2002 data reveals that the majority of respondents agree or are satisfied that their leaders are a source of esteem that increase employees’ pride, devotion, and confidence. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1: “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.”**

The total number of respondents who agree or strongly agree that their managers examine and assess the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives was 369, or 58.38% of all respondents. One hundred fifty-three employees, or 24.20% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 110 respondents, or 17.41% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA managers were seen as ideally influential on employees in examining and assessing the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

**Indicator 2: “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.”**

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that discussions with their supervisors/team leaders about their performance were worthwhile was 330, or 52.22% of all respondents. One hundred seventy-four employees, or 28.53% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 128 respondents, or 20.25% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as ideally influential on employees in discussing their performance.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the information they received from management about what's going on in their organization was 244, or 38.60% of all respondents. Two hundred fifty-nine employees, or 40.98% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 129 respondents, or 20.41% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was not seen as ideally influential on employees in letting them know what's going on in their organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>29.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>34.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with my supervisor/ team leader about my performance are worthwhile.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>23.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>37.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>28.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>30.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 8, the FHCS-2006 data reveals that the majority of respondents agreed or are satisfied that they see their as leaders a source of esteem that increases their pride, devotion and confidence in their positions. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

*Indicator 1: “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.”*

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their managers examine and assess the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives was 282, or 41.28% of all respondents. One hundred seventy-one employees, or 25.03% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 202 respondents, or 29.58% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA managers were seen as ideally influential on employees in examining and assessing the organization’s progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

*Indicator 2: “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.”*

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that discussions with their supervisors/team leaders about their performance are worthwhile was 358, or 52.41% of all respondents. One hundred sixty-four employees, or 24.01% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 161 respondents, or 23.57% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as ideally influential by employees in discussing their performance.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the information they receive from management on what’s going on in their organization was 249, or 36.46% of all respondents. Two hundred eighty-three employees, or 41.44% were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 151 respondents, or 22.11% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that the FEMA management was not seen as ideally influential by employees in letting them know what is going on in their organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>26.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>36.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussions with my supervisor/ team leader about my performance are worthwhile.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>2.03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>24.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization? | 1     | Very Dissatisfied          | 59        | 10.91   |
|                                                                                                              | 2     | Dissatisfied               | 127       | 23.48   |
|                                                                                                              |       | Neither Dissatisfied nor   | 140       | 25.88   |
|                                                                                                              | 3     | Satisfied                  | 182       | 33.64   |
|                                                                                                              | 4     | Satisfied                  | 33        | 6.10    |
|                                                                                                              | 5     | Very Satisfied             | 33        | 6.10    |
According to Table 9, the FHCS-2008 data reveals that the majority of respondents agreed or was that satisfied that they see their leaders as a source of esteem and are role models that increase their pride, devotion, and confidence in their positions. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

*Indicator 1: “Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.”*

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their managers examined and assessed the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives was 235, or 43.44% of all respondents. One hundred twenty-nine employees, or 23.85% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 144 respondents, or 26.62% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA managers were seen as ideally influential on employees in examining and assessing the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

*Indicator 2: “Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.”*

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that discussions with their supervisors/team leaders about their performance were worthwhile was 270, or 49.90% of all respondents. One hundred twenty-nine employees, or 23.84% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 131 did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as ideally influential on employees in discussing their performance.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the information they receive from management on what's going on in their organization was 215, or 39.74% of all respondents. One hundred eighty-six employees, or 34.39% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 140 respondents, or 25.88% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that the FEMA management was seen as ideally influential on employees in letting them know what's going on in their organization.

**Intellectual Stimulation**

Intellectual stimulation, as an exogenous construct, is represented with a combination score of three statements; “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development”; “How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?” and “Creativity and innovation are rewarded.” Responses were categorized by using a 5-point Likert Scale and range from “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or “do not know” (coded 0) for each item.
Table 10. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Intellectual Stimulation (Three-year data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my work unit support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee development.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>45.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>14.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your opportunity to get a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>22.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better job in your</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>29.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>25.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are rewarded.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>23.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>26.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>29.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 10, the three-year data reveals that the majority of respondents were agreed or satisfied that their leaders stimulate them to look at the world from new viewpoints, instead of old assumptions, beliefs, and paradigms. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1:** "Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development."

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors/team leaders in their work unit support employee development was 1,127, or 60.72% of all respondents. Three hundred seventy-three 373 employees, or 20.09% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 349 respondents, or 18.80% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as intellectually stimulating in supporting employee development in their organization.

**Indicator 2:** "How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?"

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with their opportunities to get a better job in their organization were 585, or 31.52% of all respondents. Seven hundred twenty-one employees, or 38.85% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 550 respondents, or 29.63% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was not seen
as intellectually stimulating in encouraging employees to get a better job in their organization.

**Indicator 3: “Creativity and innovation are rewarded.”**

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that creativity and innovation are rewarded in their organization was 678, or 36.53% of all respondents. Six hundred sixty-three employees, or 35.72% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 483 respondents, or 26.02% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA management was seen as intellectually stimulating in rewarding creativity and innovation.
Table 11. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Intellectual Stimulation (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>41.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>23.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>25.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>29.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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According to Table 11, the FHCS-2002 data reveals that the majority of respondents agreed or were satisfied that their leaders stimulated them to look at the world from new standpoints, instead of old assumptions, beliefs, and paradigms. The following paragraphs give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1:** “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors/team leaders support employee development was 348, or 55.06% of the all respondents. One hundred sixty-one employees, or 25.48% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 120 respondents, or 18.99% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as intellectually stimulating in supporting employee development in their organization.

**Indicator 2:** “How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with their opportunities to get a better job in their organization were 193, or 30.54% of all respondents. Two hundred forty-one employees, or 38.13% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 198 respondents, or 31.33% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was not seen as intellectually stimulating to employees in encouraging them to get a better job in their organization.
Indicator 3: "Creativity and innovation are rewarded."

The total number of respondent who agreed or strongly agreed that creativity and innovation are rewarded in their organization was 218, or 34.49% of all respondents. Two hundred sixty employees, or 41.14% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 143 respondents, or 22.63% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA management was not seen as intellectually stimulating in rewarding creativity and innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>18.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>48.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>23.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>28.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>22.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>22.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>28.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>29.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 12, the FHCS-2006 data reveals that the majority of respondents agreed or was satisfied that their leaders stimulated them to look at the world from new viewpoints, instead of the old assumptions, beliefs, and paradigms. The following paragraph will give statistical information at the indicator level.

*Indicator 1:* “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agree that their supervisors/team leaders support employee development was 433, or 63.39% of the respondents. One hundred and seventeen employees, or 17.13% of all disagreed or strongly disagreed; 129 respondents, or 18.89% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as intellectually stimulating in supporting employee development in their organization.

*Indicator 2:* “How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with their opportunities to get a better job in their organization were 203, or 29.72% of the all respondents. Two hundred and eighty-six employees, or 41.87% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 194 respondents, or 28.40% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was not seen as intellectually stimulating in encouraging employees to get a better job in their organization.
Indicator 3: “Creativity and innovation are rewarded.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that creativity and innovation are rewarded in their organization was 248, or 36.31% of all respondents. Two hundred thirty-two employees, or 33.96% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 194 respondents, or 28.40% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA management of FEMA was seen as intellectually stimulating in rewarding creativity and innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>48.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>29.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>20.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>26.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>30.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 13, the FHCS-2008 data revealed that the majority of respondents agreed or were satisfied that their leaders stimulated them to look at the world from new viewpoints, instead of old assumptions, beliefs, and paradigms. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1: “Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.”**

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisors/team leaders in support employee development was 346, or 63.95% of the all respondents. Ninety-five employees, or 17.56% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 100 respondents, or 18.48% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA supervisors/team leaders were seen as intellectually stimulating in supporting employee development in their organization.

**Indicator 2: ”How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?”**

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with their opportunities to get a better job in their organization were 189, or 34.93% of all respondents. One hundred ninety-four employees, or 35.86% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 158 respondents, or 29.21% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was not seen as intellectually stimulating in helping employees to advance in their organization.

**Indicator 3: ”Creativity and innovation are rewarded.”**
The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that creativity and innovation are rewarded in their organization was 212, or 39.19% of all respondents. One hundred seventy-one employees, or 31.61% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 146 respondents, or 26.99% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA management was seen as intellectually stimulating in rewarding creativity and innovation.

**Inspirational Motivation**

Inspirational motivation, as an exogenous construct, is represented with a combination score of three statements; “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes”; “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce”; and “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?” Responses are categorized using a 5-point Likert Scale and range from “strongly disagree” (coded 1), to “strongly agree” (coded 5), or do not know (coded 0) for each item.
Table 14. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Inspirational Motivation (Three-year data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>25.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>22.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>23.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>23.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>33.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>21.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>25.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>33.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 14, the three-year data reveals that the majority of respondents agreed or were satisfied that their leaders are articulate in providing meaning and a sense of purpose in what needs to be performed. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

*Indicator 1: “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.”*

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes was 528, or 28.45% of all respondents. Eight hundred fifty-one employees, or 45.85% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 467 respondents, or 25.16% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA managers were not inspirationally motivating in providing a feeling of personal empowerment to employees.

*Indicator 2: “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.”*

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce was 721, or 38.85% of all respondents. Six hundred sixty-four employees, or 35.78% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 444 respondents, or 23.92% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA leaders were seen as inspirationally motivating on employees in generating high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the recognition they receive for doing a good job was 803, or 43.26% of all respondents. Five hundred eighty-eight employees, or 21.68% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 465 respondents, or 25.05% of all respondents, stated that they were neither dissatisfied nor. The results show that FEMA management was seen as inspirationally motivating in recognizing employees for doing a good job in their organization.
Table 15. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Inspirational Motivation (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my organization, leaders generate high levels of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation and commitment in the workforce.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>26.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>28.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>26.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>31.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 15, the FHCS-2002 data revealed that the majority of respondents disagreed that their leaders provided meaning and a sense of purpose in what needs to be performed. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

Indicator 1: “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes was 174, or 27.53% of all respondents. Three hundred ten 310 employees, or 49.05% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 145 respondents, or 22.94% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA managers were not seen as inspirationally motivating in providing a feeling of personal empowerment on employees.

Indicator 2: “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce was 197, or 31.17% of all respondents. Two hundred ninety-three employees, or 46.36% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 137 respondents, or 21.68% of all respondents, did not agree or disagreed. The results show that FEMA leaders were not seen as inspirationally motivating in generating high levels of motivation and commitment on employees.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the recognition they receive for doing a good job was 258, or 40.82% of all respondents. Two hundred thirteen employees, or 33.71% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 161 respondents, or 25.47% of all were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was seen as inspirationally motivating in recognizing employees for doing a good job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my organization, leaders generate high levels of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation and commitment in the workforce.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>29.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>26.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect to work processes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>24.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>37.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>24.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>33.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 16, the FHCS-2006 data reveals that the majority of respondents disagree that their leaders provide meaning and a sense of purpose in what needs to be performed. The following paragraphs will give statistical information at the indicator level.

**Indicator 1: “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.”**

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes was 181 or 26.50% of all respondents. Three hundred ninety-six employees, or 46.27% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 183 respondents, or 26.79% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA managers were not seen as inspirationally motivating in providing a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.

**Indicator 2: “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.”**

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce was 295, or 43.19% of all respondents. Two hundred ten employees, or 30.75% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 166 respondents, or 24.30% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that the FEMA leaders were seen as inspirationally motivating in generating high levels of motivation and commitment in employees.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?”

The total number of respondent who satisfied or strongly satisfied with the recognition they receive for doing a good job was 295, or 43.19% of all respondents. Two hundred twenty-one employees, or 32.36% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 167 respondents, or 24.45% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was seen as inspirationally motivating in recognizing employees for doing a good job in their organization.
Table 17. Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Inspirational Motivation (2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>24.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>25.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>25.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>26.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>19.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>25.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>35.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 17, the FHCS-2008 data reveals that the majority of respondents disagreed that they see their leaders provide meaning and a sense of purpose in what needs to be performed. The following paragraph will give statistical information at the indicator level.

Indicator 1: “Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that they have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes was 173, or 31.98% of all respondents. Two hundred twenty-five employees, or 41.59% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 139 respondents, or 25.69% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA managers were not seen inspirationally motivating in providing a feeling of personal empowerment to employees with respect to work processes.

Indicator 2: “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.”

The total number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce was 229, or 42.32% of the all respondents. One hundred sixty-one employees, or 29.76% of all respondents, disagreed or strongly disagreed; 141 respondents, or 26.06% of all respondents, did not agree or disagree. The results show that FEMA leaders were seen as inspirationally motivating on employees in generating high levels of commitment in the workforce.
Indicator 3: “How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?”

The total number of respondents who were satisfied or strongly satisfied with the recognition they receive for doing a good job was 250, or 46.21% of all respondents. One hundred fifty-four employees, or 28.46% of all respondents, were dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied; 137 respondents, or 25.32% of all respondents, were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. The results show that FEMA management was seen as inspirationally motivating in recognizing employees for doing a good job in their organization.

**Correlations**

Correlation matrices were developed using Pearson product-moment procedures for four latent constructs in order to detect any signs of multicollinearity. Correlation matrices display a suitable way of summarizing the correlations between a pair of indicators in addition to the correlation between each indicator and the endogenous variable, therefore providing meaningful information on the direction and level of the linear relationships among the variables (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003).

Cooper and Weekes (1983) assert that multicollinearity is related with the statistical performance of the estimates of explanatory variables. It exists when two or more variables are correlated with each other. Specifically, multicollinearity causes problems such as standard errors of regression coefficients being very large and, as a result, the precision of the estimates of model coefficients could be very low.
According to Katz (2006), if two variables are correlated at more than 0.9, it will result in multicollinearity problems in an analysis. It is assumed that correlation values of less than 0.8 do not cause problems, whereas correlation values between 0.8 and 0.9 are assumed to be in the gray area.
Table 18. Correlation Matrix for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Indicators (Three-year data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLE-1</th>
<th>PLE-2</th>
<th>PLE-3</th>
<th>PLE-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLE-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLE-2</strong></td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLE-3</strong></td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLE-4</strong></td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 18, correlations are gathered in a range from .301 to .587. The highest correlation (.587) is seen between PLE-4 and PLE-2. The lowest correlation
(.301) is seen between PLE-3 and PLE-1. All indicators are correlated positive and are significant at the .01 level. Since there is no correlation more than 0.9, it is safe to say that there is no evidence of multicollinearity among perceived leadership effectiveness indicators.

Table 19. Correlation Matrix for Idealized Influence Indicators (three-year data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q40</th>
<th>Q31</th>
<th>Q55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>.505**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 19, correlations are gathered in a range from .408 to .530. The highest correlation (.530) is seen between Q55 and Q40. The lowest correlation (.408) is
seen between Q31 and Q40. All indicators are correlated positive and are significant at the .01 level. Since there is no correlation more than 0.9, it is safe to say that there is no evidence of multicollinearity among idealized influence indicators.

Table 20. Correlation Matrix for Intellectual Stimulation Indicators (three-year data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q48</th>
<th>Q58</th>
<th>Q26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

According to Table 20, correlations are gathered in a range from .472 to .562. The highest correlation (.562) is seen between Q26 and Q48. The lowest correlation (.472) is seen between Q58 and Q48. All indicators are correlated positive and are also significant.
at the .01 level. Since there is no correlation more than 0.9, it is safe to say that there is no sign of multicollinearity among intellectual stimulation indicators.

Table 21. Correlation Matrix for Inspirational Motivation Indicators (three-year pooled data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q37</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.520**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 21, correlations are gathered in a range from .520 to .588. The highest correlation (.588) is seen between Q56 and Q37. The lowest correlation (.520) is seen between Q56 and Q24. All indicators are correlated positive and are also significant.
at the .01 level. Since there is no correlation more than 0.9, it is safe to say that there is no evidence of multicollinearity among inspirational motivation indicators.

**Reliability Analysis**

Reliability analysis was conducted to demonstrate that the measurement instruments used in this study are reliable and replicable. Moser and Kalton (1989) explain that “a scale or test is reliable to the extent that repeat measurements made by it under constant conditions will give the same results (p.353).” If a research tool is consistent and constant, it can be said that it is predictable and precise in terms of being reliable. The larger the amount of consistency and continuity in an instrument, the larger its reliability. So, reliability can be defined as the extent of accuracy or precision in the measurements made by a research tool (Kumar, 2005).

A very prevalent measurement of reliability is Cronbach’s Alpha, which is used to evaluate the internal consistency reliability of research items or scores that researchers wish to put together to obtain a summary of summated scale score. The Alpha score should be positive, and as a rule greater than .70 in order to present good support for internal consistency reliability (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, & Barrett, 2004).

In this study, Cronbach’s Alpha was used to assess the internal consistency reliability of measurement instruments. Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated for the measurement model of perceived leadership effectiveness and obtained an Alpha score of .77. Since the Alpha score is positive and greater than the recommended level of .70, it
can be said that the instruments measuring perceived leadership effectiveness were satisfactory.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a method of factor analysis, in which a researcher can test very specific models of how predictors are associated with fundamental constructs or conceptual variables (Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2005). The benefit of CFA is that a researcher is required to develop a theory about the measurement of a concept and give items that echo that theory. Testing the measurement model is like of testing the theory about the nature of the constructs.

Perceived leadership effectiveness, as an endogenous latent construct, is measured by four items in order to determine how employees of FEMA perceive their leaders in terms of being effective in their positions. Responses were categorized using a 5-point Likert scale and range from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” or “do not know” for each item. CFA was performed to confirm the measurement model of the latent construct. AMOS 16 statistical software was used to see the results. Figure 5 shows the perceived leadership effectiveness measurement model after required revisions.
Figure 5. Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Revised Measurement Model.
Table 22. Parameter Estimates for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Measurement Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>GENERIC MODEL</th>
<th>REVISED MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLE-1 ← PLE</td>
<td>1 0.59</td>
<td>1 0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-2 ← PLE</td>
<td>1.527 0.826 0.068 22.612 ** 1.61 0.869 0.077 20.935 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-3 ← PLE</td>
<td>1.036 0.582 0.054 19.229 ** 0.954 0.535 0.053 18.028 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-4 ← PLE</td>
<td>1.405 0.721 0.064 22.032 ** 1.32 0.677 0.062 21.433 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3 ↔ e4</td>
<td>0.146 0.164 0.029 5.026 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = Correlation significant at p ≤ .05
S. E. = Standard Error;
U. R. W. = Unstandardized Regression Weights;
S. R. W. = Standardized Regression Weights;
C. R. = Critical Ratio

Table 22 demonstrates the parameter estimates for the hypothesized model. The entire critical ratios are greater than 1.96, which shows statistically significant relationships at p ≤ .05 levels with standardized regression weights ranging from .535 to .869. On the other hand, factor loadings were examined to detect whether there were any weak correlations between the latent construct and its indicators. All the items were loaded moderately on the common factor and were held in the measurement model. However, in order to achieve the maximum Goodness of Fit (GOF), measurement errors were correlated to elevate modification indices that were theoretically congruent.
Table 23. Goodness of Fit Statistics for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Measurement Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>GENERIC MODEL</th>
<th>REVISED MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square (x²)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>&gt; .0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio (x²/df)</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>14.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted GFI (AGFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoelter’s Critical N (CN)</td>
<td>&gt; 200</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 presents the GOF statistics for perceived leadership effectiveness. As seen on the table, the revised model has significantly improved in the model fit scores. The chi-square value has improved from 28.257 to 1.610 and the lower the chi-square value, the better the model fit. The chi-square-degrees of freedom-likelihood ratio has improved from 14.129 to 1.610, which is lower than 4. The probability score has improved from .00 to .205. The Goodness-of-fit index (GFI) value is 1.000, which is perfectly fit. The adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) value is .996, which almost perfectly fits. The normed fit index (NFI) value is .999 which perfectly fits. The incremental fit index (IFI) value of 1.000 perfectly fits. The Tucker Lewis index (TLI) value is .998, which almost perfectly fits. The comparative fit index (CFI) value of 1.000 perfectly fits. The root mean square error of approximation value has improved from .084 to .018. And Hoelter’s critical N-value has improved from 394 to 4427. As a result, the revised model provided a good fit to the data and was confirmed as the measurement model for the latent construct of perceived leadership effectiveness.

**Structural Equation Model (SEM)**

After confirming the perceived leadership effectiveness measurement model, a generic perceived leadership effectiveness SEM model was developed. The perceived leadership effectiveness endogenous latent construct was explained by three exogenous latent constructs of the transformational leadership’s dimensions: idealized influence,
intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. The hypothesized generic model as seen in Figure 6 was exposed to structural equation modeling by using AMOS 16.

![Diagram](image-url)  
Figure 6. Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Generic SEM Model.
According to the outcomes of the confirmatory factor analysis, the hypothesized structural equation model was revised. The revised model as seen in Figure 7 was exposed to structural equation modeling by using AMOS 16.

Figure 7. Perceived Leadership Effectiveness Revised SEM Model.
Table 24. Parameter Estimates for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness SEM Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>GENERIC MODEL</th>
<th>REVISED MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.R.</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE ← IDEAINF</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAINF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE ← INTELSTIMU</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELSTIMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE ← INSPMOTIV</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPMOTIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-1 ← PLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-2 ← PLE</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-3 ← PLE</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE-4 ← PLE</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAINF ← IDEAINF</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELSTIMU ← IDEAINF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELSTIMU</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>← INSPMOTIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>GENERIC MODEL</td>
<td>REVISED MODEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.R.W.</td>
<td>S.R. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAINF ↔</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.239 ***</td>
<td>26.239 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPMOTIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3 ↔ e4</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>5.616 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** = Correlation is significant at p≤ .05

Parameter estimates of the generic and revised structural equation model are displayed in Table 24. In order to achieve the maximum GOF, error terms were re-examined. Insignificant correlations among error terms were deleted, and significantly correlated ones were combined to elevate modification indices. All critical ratios were seen as greater than 1.96, which shows statistically significant relationships at p ≤ .05 level. The standardized regression weights of exogenous variables are: .241 for idealized influence, .477 for intellectual stimulation, and .287 for inspirational motivation. Intellectual stimulation has the highest regression weight and idealized influence has the weakest regression weight on the perception of leadership effectiveness.

On the other hand, the correlations among the exogenous constructs reveal that the highest correlation is between intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation (.81), and the lowest correlation is between intellectual stimulation and idealized influence (.72). The correlation between idealized influence and inspirational motivation
is .77. Overall, these predictor variables accounted for 86% of the variance in perceived leadership effectiveness.

Table 25. Goodness of Fit Statistics for the Perceived Leadership Effectiveness SEM Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of Fit Statistics for the Perceived Leadership Effectiveness SEM Model</th>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>GENERIC MODEL</th>
<th>REVISED MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square (x2)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60.063</td>
<td>26.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>&gt; .0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio (x2/df)</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>6.006</td>
<td>2.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted GFI (AGFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITERION</td>
<td>GENERIC MODEL</td>
<td>REVISED MODEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Lewis Index</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TLI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoelter’s Critical N (CN) (.05)</td>
<td>&gt; 200</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 presents the GOF statistics for the generic and revised perceived leadership effectiveness SEM model. As seen on the table, the revision slightly improved the model fit scores. The chi-square value has improved from 60.063 to 26.643 and the lower the chi-square value, the better the model fit. The chi-square-degrees-of-freedom-likelihood ratio has improved from 6.006 to 2.664, which is lower than 4. The probability score has improved from .00 to .003. The Goodness-of-fit index (GFI) value is .996,
which almost perfectly fits. The adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) value is .989, which almost perfectly fits. The normed fit index (NFI) value is .997, which almost perfectly fits. The incremental fit index (IFI) value of .998 almost perfectly fits. The Tucker Lewis index (TLI) value is .996, which almost perfectly fits. The comparative fit index (CFI) value of .998, almost perfectly fits. The root mean square error of approximation value has improved from .052 to .030. And Hoelter’s critical N- value has improved from 566 to 1275. As a result, the revised model provided a good fit to the data.

**Hypothesis Testing**

This study aimed to test the following proposed research hypotheses for the generic research model:

\[ H1: \text{Idealized influence behaviors are positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.} \]

Transforming leaders who are ideally influential on their followers promote the argument of having important common values and beliefs, stimulating the significance of a strong sense of purpose, and emphasizing the importance of a collective sense of the organization’s mission (Bass & Avolio, 1994; 2004; Gozubenli, 2009).

On the basis of the analysis results, it is apparent that the study supported the research hypothesis. With a standard regression weight of positive .24, there was a statistically significant association between idealized influence behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness. This positive association proposes that one standard deviation
increase in the idealized influence behaviors suggests a 24% increase on perceived leadership effectiveness. For this reason, the null was rejected and it was concluded that if the leaders of FEMA become ideally influential, such as becoming role models for federal employees, it will increase employees’ perceptions about their leaders’ effectiveness.

**H2: Intellectual stimulation behaviors are positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.**

Transformative leaders stimulate the ideas of their followers and support their attempts to be more innovative and creative in solving problems by questioning statements, re-describing problems, and accessing old situations in new ways. This stimulation mostly takes place through a course of empowering followers to take initiative (Riggio & Orr, 2004).

On the basis of the analysis results, it is apparent that the study supported the research hypothesis. With a standard regression weight of positive .48, there was a statistically significant association between intellectual stimulation behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness. This positive association proposes that one standard deviation increase in the intellectual stimulation behaviors suggests a 48% increase on perceived leadership effectiveness. Therefore, the null was rejected and it was concluded that if the leaders of FEMA intellectually stimulate the employees, such as allowing them to share in a common vision, it will increase the employees’ perceptions about their leaders’ effectiveness.
**H3:** Inspirational motivation behaviors are positively associated with perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA.

Transforming leaders demonstrate inspirational motivation when they work with employees to do their very best and surpass expectations. Consequently, the utilization of inspirational motivation would increase employees’ feelings of self-reliance and self-efficacy and enable them to succeed optimally in their job (Snyder & Lopez, 2002).

On the basis of the analysis results, it is apparent that the study supported the research hypothesis. With a standard regression weight of positive .29, there was a statistically significant association between inspirational motivation behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness. This positive association proposes that one standard deviation increase in the inspirational motivation behaviors suggests a 29% increase on perceived leadership effectiveness. Consequently, the null was rejected and it was concluded that if the leaders of FEMA build trust through individual commitment and provide a sense of purpose in what needs to be performed, it will increase the employees’ perceptions about their leaders’ effectiveness.

**H4:** Idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation are correlated with each other.

Transforming leaders hold certain behaviors that help them to be effective, such as generating a vision, allowing others to carry out the vision (intellectual stimulation), communicating a vision that arouses (charisma), promoting commitment in followers
(individualized consideration), and creating trust through individual commitment
(inspirational motivation) (Conger, 1989).

The revised model confirms that dimensions of transformational leadership are
positively correlated with each other. The highest correlation is between intellectual
stimulation and inspirational motivation (.81), and the lowest correlation is between
intellectual stimulation and idealized influence (.72). The correlation between idealized
influence and inspirational motivation is .77.

**Comparison of Different Years and Leadership Effectiveness**

One of the goals of this study was to answer the research question, “to what extent
does perceived leadership effectiveness differ when FEMA is independent or within the
DHS?” In terms of covering FEMA’s two different status levels, the three-year data let us
test the model to see whether the variation among years differs in connection with
FEMA’s structure. For that reason, the revised Perceived Leadership Effectiveness SEM
model was retested by multiple group analysis in order to find out whether a difference
exists between transformational leadership behaviors and perceived leadership
effectiveness in FEMA.

All critical ratios were seen as greater than 1.96, which shows statistically
significant relationships at \( p \leq .05 \) level. Each year’s data was independently tested for a
good model fit to verify model equivalence, and they all provided satisfactory model fits
with small difference in variances and covariances.
Figure 8. Structural Model for Year Comparison (2002).
Figure 9. Structural Model for Year Comparison (2006).
Figure 10. Structural Model for Year Comparison (2008).
Table 26. Summary Table of Correlations for Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLE ← IDEAINF</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE ← INTELSTIMU</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE ← INSPMOTIV</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAINF ↔ INTELSTIMU</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELSTIMU ↔ INSPMOTIV</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAINF ↔ INSPMOTIV</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = Correlation significant at p ≤ .05

According to Table 26, idealized influence increased a little, from .23 to .26 in 2006, and then slightly decreased to .24 in 2008. It can be said that there was no significant difference in the variances of idealized influence during the three observation points. On the contrary, there was an obvious decrease, from .52 to .42, in the variances of intellectual stimulation in 2006 that may be a consequence of FEMA’s structure change in becoming a sub-agency within DHS. In 2008, it increased slightly from .42 to .46. On the other hand, although there was a small increase, from .26 to .29, in the variances of inspirational motivation in 2006, there was no difference in 2008.
Table 27. Goodness of Fit Statistics for Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>MODEL RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square (x2)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Of Freedom (df)</td>
<td>&gt; .0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio (x2 /df)</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted GFI (AGFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Fit Index (RFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>&gt; .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoelter’s Critical N (CN) (.05)</td>
<td>&gt; 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 presents the GOF statistics for year comparison of perceived leadership effectiveness. The results were almost perfect, except the probability level was not
greater than .05, but that can be ignored because the data has a large sample size. As a result, it can be concluded that the year-comparison model provided a good fit to the data.

In summary, this chapter provided details about the findings of the study. It contained descriptive analysis for each year’s data, correlation matrices, reliability analysis, confirmatory factor analysis of the measurement model, the results of structural equation model, hypothesis testing, and comparison of years.

The following chapter provides a summary of findings, gives details about the limitations, expresses possible implications, and suggests future studies in order to advance leadership study in public organizations, particularly for FEMA.
CHAPTER V: IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a summary of findings, gives details on limitations, possible implications, and future studies. It also discusses how to promote innovation, creativity, and adaptability to an organizational environment that increases the organizations’ public performance.

Summary of Findings

This study has found that transformational leadership behaviors—idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation—all have a significant relationship with perceived leadership effectiveness. Each dimension of transformational leadership has a positive effect on employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness, with intellectual stimulation having the highest effect. These findings will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

Idealized Influence

This study hypothesized a positive association between idealized influence behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA. As stated in the hypothesis testing and based on analysis results, this hypothesis was supported with a standard
regression weight of positive .24 that shows a statistically significant relationship between the two. This positive relationship suggests that if FEMA leaders become ideally influential on their followers by having high levels of morality or dedicating themselves to the greatest ideals, employee perceptions would increase as regards to their leaders’ effectiveness. Hence, the study results are consistent with the literature.

This was one of the expected findings of this study. As extensively discussed in Chapter II, if followers recognize the leader as a role model, they start to share the leader’s concerns. Problems may then be tailored by leaders who demonstrate superior levels of ethical and moral conduct. This will then raise the readiness of followers to recognize the problem as their own (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

However, the results of the structural equation model of perceived leadership effectiveness reveals that idealized influence was the weakest dimension of transformational leadership, with a standard regression weight of positive .24 and affects the perceptions of federal employees about leadership effectiveness in FEMA according to the three-year data. On the other hand, the descriptive analysis results also tell us that even if leaders assessed the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives, and properly discussed employees’ performances with them, the employees were still dissatisfied with the information they received from management. This appears to be one of the factors that explain why idealized influence dimension had less influence on changing the perceptions of federal employees in FEMA.
In addition, the latent construct of idealized influence displayed a positive association with inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation. The covariation of positive .77 between idealized influence and inspirational motivation demonstrates that when leaders become good role models, followers are more likely to feel a sense of purpose in performing what is necessary for the organization. A similar association exists between idealized influence and intellectual stimulation, with a covariation of positive .72. This also reveals that when leaders become good role models, followers are more likely to be stimulated to view the world from new perspectives.

**Intellectual Stimulation**

This study hypothesized a positive association between intellectual stimulation behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA. On the basis of analysis results, as stated in the hypothesis testing, the research hypothesis was supported with a standard regression coefficient of positive .48 that explains a statistically significant association between intellectual stimulation behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness. This positive association suggests that if FEMA leaders allow employees to create a vision and generate new ideas, which are not completely different from the strategies and ideas of the leaders’ own, it will increase employees’ perceptions about their leaders’ effectiveness.

As discussed in Chapter II, intellectually stimulating leaders can modify perspectives or discover hidden assumptions (Bass & Avolio, 1999). Additionally, when
leader actions enhance follower self-efficacy it could result in higher levels of follower vision in problem-solving situations. For that reason, leader-follower collaborations are significant in terms of escalating followers’ beliefs in order to reach mutual solutions to problems (Redmond et al., 1993).

The results of the structural equation model of perceived leadership effectiveness shows that intellectual stimulation was the strongest dimension of transformational leadership, with a standard regression coefficient of positive .48 and affects the perceptions of federal employees about leadership effectiveness in FEMA.

On the other hand, the descriptive analysis results tell us that even if leaders’ support employee development and adequately reward creativity and innovation in their work, employees were dissatisfied with their job opportunities. This appears to be a reason why leaders should take employee development into consideration—to increase their influence on employees’ changing perceptions.

Furthermore, the latent construct of intellectual stimulation displayed a positive association with inspirational motivation and idealized influence. The covariation of positive .81 between intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation demonstrates that when leaders stimulate employees by empowering to take initiative, followers will have a feeling of self-reliance that enables them to be successful in their job. A similar association exists between intellectual stimulation and idealized influence, with a covariation of positive .72. This also reveals that when leaders work with employees to
do their very best and surpass expectations, employees understand the importance of having a collective sense of the organization’s mission.

**Inspirational Motivation**

This study hypothesized a positive association between inspirational motivation behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness in FEMA. On the basis of analysis results, and as stated in the hypothesis testing, this research hypothesis was supported with a standard regression weight of positive .29 that explains a statistically significant relationship between inspirational motivation behaviors and perceived leadership effectiveness. This positive association suggests that if FEMA leaders provide significant and challenging work, clearly explain their vision, communicate the importance of the organization’s mission and objectives, it will increase employees’ perceptions about their leaders’ effectiveness.

As discussed in the literature review, inspirationally motivating leaders speak positively and passionately about the future and have confidence that they will achieve organizational goals. Transformational leaders also stimulate team spirit and generate hopefulness and passion among followers (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994, 2004). Conger (1991) mentions that the most effective leaders are the ingenious craftsmen of their organization's mission. They can communicate their missions in ways that create great fundamental demand.
The results of the structural equation model of perceived leadership effectiveness demonstrates that inspirational motivation was the second strongest dimension of transformational leadership, with a standard regression coefficient of positive .29 and affects the perceptions of federal employees about leadership effectiveness in FEMA.

On the other hand, the descriptive analysis results tells us that even if leaders generate high levels of motivation, and recognize when employees do a good job, employees are still dissatisfied in terms of feeling personal empowerment at work. This appears to be why inspirational motivation did not get sufficient influence on changing the perceptions of federal employees in FEMA.

Furthermore, the latent construct of inspirational motivation presented a positive association with intellectual stimulation and idealized influence. The covariation of positive .81 between inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation shows that when leaders provide significant and challenging work, clearly explain their vision, and communicate the importance of the organization’s mission and objectives to their followers, leader-follower cooperation can be achieved to find mutual solutions to problems. A similar association exists between inspirational motivation and idealized influence, with a covariation of positive .77. This also reveals that when leaders provide a sense of purpose in what needs to be performed, employees get feel pride, devotion and confidence.
Implications

Organizational and Managerial Implications

Communication and information sharing with followers is vital for organizational survival. Burns (1978) claims that communication is key in accomplishing goals as well as to reach optimum outcomes by focusing the group. The leader uses the chain of command to finalize the job and focuses on the big picture, along with those who are responsible for task details. Kapucu and Van Wart (2008) state that informing critical information to followers, peers, or people outside the organization is one of the competencies to prevent making matters worse in a disaster management organization.

The study findings reveal that the employees working in FEMA were dissatisfied in receiving necessary information about what’s going on in the organization. When leaders do not pass the information sufficiently and do not keep open the ways of communicating, it would be hard to own leaders’ concerns and have a sense of purpose in the organization. The management of FEMA should allow its personnel to communicate both top-down and bottom-up.

Yukl (2009) affirms that the significance of learning from experience on the job has now extensively been accepted, and researchers have started to establish the associations between specific experiences and specific leadership competencies. Overall, further growth occurs for leaders who have tough experiences that involve adjustment to innovative situations and provide opportunity to learn to cope with a variety of dissimilar
types of problems and difficulties. Extra learning also crops up as people get precise feedback about their behavior and learn from them.

This is also applicable for subordinates. When sufficient opportunities are provided to do a better job in the organizations, the subordinates can get further experience and knowledge in order to own the missions and visions of their organization. Bass (1990) reveals that leaders can be intellectually stimulating to their subordinates if their personal jobs let them to examine new opportunities, to analyze organizational problems, and to make solutions.

The study findings show that subordinates in FEMA were dissatisfied in receiving better job opportunities in their organizations. The FEMA executives should allow subordinates to find alternative job opportunities to enhance their learning and to obtain new leadership competencies.

**Policy Implications**

Bass (1999) state that “members of transformational teams care about each other, intellectually stimulate each other, inspire each other, and identify with the team’s goals. Transformational teams are high-performing. Organizational policies and practices can promote employee empowerment, creative flexibility and esprit de corps”—which is morale of a group.

In the findings of their research, Trottier, Van Wart and Wang (2008) conclude that provided almost fifteen years of total quality management and reinventing
government programs, leaders in government agencies were weak in generating high scales of motivation, possession of work developments and feelings of empowerment.

The findings of this study confirm that the federal employees in FEMA were still dissatisfied in terms of feeling personal empowerment at work. Therefore, policymakers should promote leaders to obtain inspirational motivation behaviors and to use them to give a feeling of personal empowerment to the employees.

**Contribution of the Study**

This study has some important contributions to the contemporary academic literature, as it examines the leadership concept in a federal setting. Van Wart (2003) claims that leadership research has been insufficiently researched in public administration literature. This study can contribute to public administration literature by examining the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on the perceptions of leadership effectiveness in FEMA.

Fernandez (2008) states that more research is needed to understand how leaders who encourage innovation, creativity, and adaptability to the environment affect public organizations. This study illustrates which transforming leader behaviors would promote innovation, creativity, motivation, commitment, devotion, and a sense of purpose.

Another significant finding of this study is that it utilizes OPM’s Federal Human Capital Surveys (FHCS), which current research shows are underutilized. Even if the
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previous studies used only one or two years’ FHCS datasets in their analysis, this study used three different year’s FHCS datasets.

The perspective of this study has also a unique contribution to leadership research, since we used FHCS data from three different years to examine effects of transformational leadership behaviors on perceived leadership effectiveness of federal employees in FEMA. FEMA was an independent agency when the first FHCS was conducted in 2002. As of March 1, 2003, FEMA became a directorate under the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). FEMA was a sub-agency within DHS when the third and fourth surveys were conducted in 2006 and 2008. By choosing these specific periods of time, this study aimed to determine whether employees’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness differed depending on FEMA’s structural change.

**Limitations**

Some may think that using secondary data with high response rates helps achieve better results and that secondary data with a large sample size is superior as it improves the validity of the survey. On the other hand, some may see this as a limitation, because there the questionnaires remain the same and it is impossible to add new questions or predictor variables. From this perspective, the datasets used in this study had some problematic aspects. For instance, some predictor variables had too many missing values or the values were not loaded properly to the source. In addition, the structure of FHCS-2002 was different than the structures of FHCS-2006 and FHCS-2008. Only four control
variables were the same due to missing values and different coding, and they were not included in the analysis. Hence, no control variables have been utilized in the SEM models. This limited the study’s findings.

Multicollinearity is related to the statistical performance of the explanatory variables’ estimates. It exists when two or more variables are correlated with each other. It causes problems, however, such as that standard errors of regression coefficients could be too large and the estimate’s precision of model coefficients could be very low (Cooper & Weekes, 1983). Signs of multicollinearity were detected in early attempts of measurement model constructions for confirmatory factor analysis. Because the questions which specifically measure certain dimensions of transformational leadership were similar, some questions fit more than one latent construct. Therefore, measurement models for the dimensions of transformational leadership were not built; instead, these dimensions have been represented as exogenous latent constructs in the SEM model. This lessened the findings of this study.

Federal Human Capital Surveys have been conducted by OPM every two years to evaluate the circumstances that characterize high performance organizations. The survey was first conducted in 2002 and repeated in 2004, 2006, and 2008. The test content was almost identical each year. It is assumed that the participants knew what they are going to be asked, and how they will respond each year. If they are tested repeatedly, this may result in bias as repeatedly testing threatens internal validity. If the participants remember
the questions, they may answer them in a way to achieve specific results. From this perspective, the findings of this study might be misleading.

Although there are plenty of resources about transformational leadership in some certain areas, there are fewer resources in the literature about the leadership gap or leadership does not seem the most important issue needs to be put effort on public organizations particularly in disaster management. Lack of resources is one of the limitations of this study; because transformational leadership has not been discussed sufficiently for disaster management organizations in the literature.

**Future Studies**

Findings from this study demonstrate that the three dimensions of transformational leadership have positive effects on perceived leadership effectiveness, and intellectual stimulation behaviors have the highest effect. As this study only examined the effects of three dimensions of transformational leadership on perceived leadership effectiveness, additional research should be undertaken to examine and contextualize broader outcomes of transformational leadership.

Future studies may also see the impact of FHCS control variables such as gender, race, location of work, supervisory status, pay categories, etc. In addition, future research may include follow-up studies with future OPM data to examine longitudinal trends, conduct large-scale research on the disposition and effects of leadership in state and local
governments, and explore some of the main situational characteristics of leadership in public settings (Trottier, Van Wart and Wang, 2008).

This study only aimed to see the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on employees’ perceptions in FEMA. Future research may repeat this study in other federal agencies to see whether the findings are valid.

**Conclusion**

Emergency management is the course of developing and executing emergency policies that are pertinent to mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities. To achieve all the expected efforts before and after a disastrous event, a stronger command and control system must be established. These efforts would be more meaningful and successful by understanding the importance of the leadership role. Therefore, leaders have to set up new strategies which are derived from effective management policies.

Yet a national preparedness process has been changing according to recent experiences. Learning from disaster can be important, but it is not enough. Emergency management organizations should not wait until a disaster occurs to learn lessons; they must determine their strengths and weaknesses beforehand. It is important to do the right thing at the right time. To avoid harsher lessons due to a lack of preparedness, it is necessary to implement improvement before it’s too late.
Attaining and following transformational leadership behaviors are more helpful to the leaders of disaster management organizations, because transforming leaders are likely to be more effectual in chaotic environments. They look for new strategies for work, take into account the followers’ commitment, exchange information with the followers, and are more open to generate quick and prompt decisions when needed.
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Demographics Items

What is your agency?
[Federal Emergency Management Agency]

What is your agency sub-unit?
[ EM99 ]

What is your supervisory status?
[ N ] Non-Supervisor: You do not supervise other employees.
[ N ] Team Leader: You provide employees with day-to-day guidance in conducting work projects, but do not perform supervisory responsibilities and are not an official supervisor.
[ S ] Supervisor: You are a supervisor of employees, but you do not supervise any other supervisors.
[ S ] Manager: You supervise one or more supervisors.
[ X ] Executive: Member of Senior Executive Service or Equivalent.
[ * ] missing value

Are you:
[ M ] Male
[ F ] Female
[ * ] missing value

Please select one or more of the following categories to describe your race:
[ N ] White AND non-Hispanic, non-Latino, and non-Spanish
[ M ] Black or African American
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Strategic Alignment Section

Q1 - In my work unit, human resources management strategies are targeted to achieve my agency's missions and objectives.

Q2 - Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

Q3 - Products and services in my work unit are improved based on customer/public input.

Q4 - I am kept informed about changes in personnel policies and employee benefits.

Q5 - I know how my work relates to the agency's missions and goals.

Q6 - Information collected on my work unit's performance is used to improve my work unit's performance.

VALUE LABEL: Q1/Q-6

[ 5 ] Strongly Agree
[ 4 ] Agree
[ 3 ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ 2 ] Disagree
[ 1 ] Strongly Disagree
[ X ] Do Not Know

Strategic Competencies (Talent) Section
Q7- The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals.
Q8- The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.
Q9- My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues.
Q10- My workload is reasonable.
Q11- My talents are used well in the workplace.
Q12- This is a friendly place to work.
Q13- I recommend my organization as a good place to work.
Q14- I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget, etc.) to get my job done.
Q15- My work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills.
Q16- Selections for promotions in my work unit are based on merit.

VALUE LABEL: Q-7/Q-16
[ 5 ] Strongly Agree
[ 4 ] Agree
[ 3 ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ 2 ] Disagree
[ 1 ] Strongly Disagree
[ X ] Do Not Know

Leadership Section
Q17- Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employee(s) with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.
Q18- Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit encourage my development at work.
Q19- The work I do is important.
Q20- In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.
Q21- Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment and ownership of work processes.
Q22- Supervisors/team leaders are receptive to change.
Q23- I hold my organization's leaders in high regard.
Q24- My organization's leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.
Q25- Complaints, disputes or grievances are resolved fairly in my work unit.
Q26- Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.
Q27- I can disclose a suspected violation of law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.
Q28- I know what the Merit System Principles are.
Q29- I know what the Prohibited Personnel Practices are.
Q30- I know what to do if I believe that a Prohibited Personnel Practice has been committed.

VALUE LABEL: Q-17/Q-30
[ 5 ] Strongly Agree
[ 4 ] Agree
[ 3 ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ 2 ] Disagree
[ 1 ] Strongly Disagree
[ X ] Do Not Know

Performance Culture Section
Q31- Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.
Q32- High-performing employees in my work unit are recognized or rewarded on a timely basis.
Q33- Employees are rewarded for providing high quality products and services to customers.
Q34- Creativity and innovation are rewarded.
Q35- My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.
Q36- Our organization's awards program provides me with an incentive to do my best.
Q37- In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.
Q38- I believe my organization can perform its function as effectively as any private sector provider.
Q39- I am held accountable for achieving results.
Q40- Physical conditions (for example, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well.
Q41- Discussions with my supervisor/team-leader about my performance are worthwhile.
Q42- Supervisors/team-leaders in my work unit are committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.
Q43- Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).
Q44- Managers/supervisors/team leaders work well with employees of different backgrounds.

VALUE LABEL: Q-31/Q-44

[ 5 ] Strongly Agree
[ 4 ] Agree
[ 3 ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ 2 ] Disagree
[ 1 ] Strongly Disagree
[ X ] Do Not Know

Learning (Knowledge Management) Section
Q45- Employees have electronic access to learning and training programs readily available at their desk.
Q46- My training needs are assessed.
Q47- Employees are willing to be retrained and moved to other positions in the organization.
Q48- I receive the training I need to perform my job.
Q49- Employees in my work unit share their knowledge with each other.
Q50- Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources).

VALUE LABEL: Q-45/Q-50
[ 5 ] Strongly Agree
[ 4 ] Agree
[ 3 ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ 2 ] Disagree
[ 1 ] Strongly Disagree
[ X ] Do Not Know

Personal Experiences Section
Q51- The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.
Q52- I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.
Q53- I have enough information to do my job well.
Q54- I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.
Q55- My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.
Q56- My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.
Q57- I like the kind of work I do.

VALUE LABEL: Q-51/Q-57
[ 5 ] Strongly Agree
[ 4 ] Agree
[ 3 ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ 2 ] Disagree
[ 1 ] Strongly Disagree

Q58- How do you rate the amount of pay you get on your job?
Q59- How do you rate your total benefits program?
Q60- Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor/team leader?
Q61- How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work group?

VALUE LABEL: Q-58/Q-61
[ 5 ] Very Good
[ 3 ] Fair
[ 2 ] Poor
[ 1 ] Very Poor

Q62- How would you rate your organization as an organization to work for compared to other organizations?

VALUE LABEL: Q-62
[ 5 ] One of the Best
[ 4 ] Above Average
[ 3 ] Average
[ 2 ] Below Average
[ 1 ] One of the Worst
Job Satisfaction Section

Q63- How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?
Q64- How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?
Q65- How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?
Q66- How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?
Q68- Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?
Q69- Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction in your organization at the present time?

VALUE LABEL: Q-63/Q-69

[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Compensation and Benefits Section

Q70- Please rank the items below in terms of their importance to you. When ranking the highest value is a 1 and the lowest value is a 6. Please rank ALL six items (Note: you can only use a value ONCE in the rank):

VALUE LABEL: Q-70

[ 1, ] Your Pay
[ 2, ] Retirement Benefits
[ 3, ] Life Insurance Benefits
[ 4, ] Health Insurance Benefits
[ 5, ] Long Term Care Benefits
[ 6, ] Paid Time Off (Leave)

Q71- How satisfied are you with your pay:
Q72- How satisfied are you with retirement benefits:
Q73- How satisfied are you with life insurance benefits:
Q74- How satisfied are you with health insurance benefits:
Q75- How satisfied are you with Long Term Care benefits:
Q76- How satisfied are you with paid time Off (Leave):

VALUE LABEL: Q-71/Q-76
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Q77- Please rank the following 5 items in terms of their importance to you.
When ranking the highest value is a 1 and the lowest value is a 5. Please rank
ALL five items (Note: you can only use a value ONCE in the rank):

VALUE LABEL: Q-77
[ 1, ] Paid vacation time
[ 2, ] Paid leave for personal illness
[ 3, ] Paid leave for family illness
[ 4, ] Paid leave for childbirth/adoption
[ 5, ] Paid leave for elder care
Q78- How satisfied are you with paid vacation time:
Q79- How satisfied are you with paid leave for personal illness:
Q80- How satisfied are you with paid leave for family illness:
Q81- How satisfied are you with paid leave for childbirth/adoPTION:
Q82- How satisfied are you with paid leave for elder care:

VALUE LABEL: Q-78/Q-82
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Family Friendly Flexibilities Section
Q83a- How satisfied are you with telework/telecommuting:

VALUE LABEL: Q-83a
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Q83b- How important is telework/telecommuting to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-83b
[ 5 ] Extremely Important
[ 4 ] Very Important
[ 3 ] Moderately Important
[ 2 ] Somewhat Important
[ 1 ] Not Important

Q83c- Is telework/telecommuting available to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-83c
[ 1 ] Yes
[ 2 ] No
[ 3 ] Do Not Know

Q84a- How satisfied are you with alternative work schedules?

VALUE LABEL: Q-84a
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Q84b- How important is alternative work schedules to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-84b
[ 5 ] Extremely Important
[ 4 ] Very Important
[ 3 ] Moderately Important
[ 2 ] Somewhat Important
[ 1 ] Not Important
Q84c- Are alternative work schedules available to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-84c
[ 1 ] Yes
[ 2 ] No
[ 3 ] Do Not Know

Q85a- How satisfied are you with child care subsidies?

VALUE LABEL: Q-85a
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Q85b- How important are child care subsidies to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-85b
[ 5 ] Extremely Important
[ 4 ] Very Important
[ 3 ] Moderately Important
[ 2 ] Somewhat Important
[ 1 ] Not Important

Q85c- Are child care subsidies available to you?
VALUE LABEL: Q-85c
[ 1 ] Yes
[ 2 ] No
[ 3 ] Do Not Know

Q86a- How satisfied are you with employee assistance programs?

VALUE LABEL: Q-86a
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Q86b- How important are employee assistance programs to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-86b
[ 5 ] Extremely Important
[ 4 ] Very Important
[ 3 ] Moderately Important
[ 2 ] Somewhat Important
[ 1 ] Not Important

Q86c- Are employee assistance programs available to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-86c
[ 1 ] Yes
[ 2 ] No
Q87a- How satisfied are you with health and wellness programs?

VALUE LABEL: Q-87a
[4] Satisfied
[3] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[2] Dissatisfied
[1] Very Dissatisfied

Q87b- How important are health and wellness programs to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-87b
[5] Extremely Important
[4] Very Important
[3] Moderately Important
[2] Somewhat Important
[1] Not Important

Q87c- Are health and wellness programs available to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-87c
[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Do Not Know

Q88a- How satisfied are you with support groups:
VALUE LABEL: Q-88a
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

Q88b- How important are support groups to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-88b
[ 5 ] Extremely Important
[ 4 ] Very Important
[ 3 ] Moderately Important
[ 2 ] Somewhat Important
[ 1 ] Not Important

Q88c- Are support groups available to you?

VALUE LABEL: Q-88c
[ 1 ] Yes
[ 2 ] No
[ 3 ] Do Not Know

Q89a- How satisfied are you with elder care programs?

VALUE LABEL: Q-89a
[ 4 ] Satisfied
[ 3 ] Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied
[ 2 ] Dissatisfied
[ 1 ] Very Dissatisfied

**Q89b-** How important are elder care programs to you?

**VALUE LABEL: Q-89b**
[ 5 ] Extremely Important
[ 4 ] Very Important
[ 3 ] Moderately Important
[ 2 ] Somewhat Important
[ 1 ] Not Important

**Q89c-** Are elder care programs available to you?

**VALUE LABEL: Q-89c**
[ 1 ] Yes
[ 2 ] No
[ 3 ] Do Not Know

**Q98-** Are you considering leaving your organization?

**VALUE LABEL: Q-98**
[ Y ] Yes
[ N ] No
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2006 FEDERAL HUMAN CAPITAL SURVEY

Q1-Q73

1. The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.
2. I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.
3. I have enough information to do my job well.
4. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.
5. My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.
6. I like the kind of work I do.
7. I have trust and confidence in my supervisor.
8. I recommend my organization as a good place to work.
9. Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor/team leader?
10. How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work group?
11. The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals.
12. My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues.
13. Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.
14. My work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills.
15. The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.
16. I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget) to get my job done.
17. My workload is reasonable.
18. My talents are used well in the workplace.
19. I know how my work relates to the agency's goals and priorities.
20. The work I do is important.
21. Physical conditions (for example, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well.

22. Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.

23. In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.

24. Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.

25. Employees are rewarded for providing high quality products and services to customers.

26. Creativity and innovation are rewarded.

27. Pay raises depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

28. Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

29. In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.

30. My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.

31. Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.

32. I am held accountable for achieving results.

33. Supervisors/team-leaders in my work unit are committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.

34. Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).

35. Managers/supervisors/team leaders work well with employees of different backgrounds.

36. I have a high level of respect for my organization’s senior leaders.

37. In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.

38. My organization's leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.

39. Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.
40. Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

41. Employees are protected from health and safety hazards on the job.

42. My organization has prepared employees for potential security threats.

43. Complaints, disputes or grievances are resolved fairly in my work unit.

44. Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.

45. Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person’s right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans’ preference requirements) are not tolerated.

46. I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.

47. Supervisors/team leaders provide employees with constructive suggestions to improve their job performance.

48. Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.

49. Employees have electronic access to learning and training programs readily available at their desk.

50. My training needs are assessed.

51. Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, and needed resources).

52. Employees in my work unit share job knowledge with each other.

53. Employees use information technology (for example, intranet, shared networks) to perform work.

54. How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?

55. How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?

56. How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?

57. How satisfied are you with the policies and practices of your senior leaders?
58. How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?
59. How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?
60. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?
61. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your pay?
62. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization?
63. How satisfied are you with retirement benefits?
64. How satisfied are you with health insurance benefits?
65. How satisfied are you with life insurance benefits?
66. How satisfied are you with long term care insurance benefits?
67. How satisfied are you with the flexible spending account (FSA) program?
68. How satisfied are you with paid vacation time?
69. How satisfied are you with paid leave for illness (for example, personal), including family care situations (for example, childbirth/adoption or eldercare)?
70. How satisfied are you with child care subsidies?
71. How satisfied are you with work/life programs (for example, health and wellness, employee assistance, eldercare, and support groups)?
72. How satisfied are you with telework/telecommuting?
73. How satisfied are you with alternative work schedules?

VALUE LABELS
/Q1 TO Q8
   5 "Strongly Agree "
   4 "Agree "
   3 "Neither Agree nor Disagree "
   2 "Disagree "
   1 "Strongly Disagree ">
/Q9 TO Q10
5 "Very Good"
4 "Good"
3 "Fair"
2 "Poor"
1 "Very Poor"

/Q11 TO Q53
5 "Strongly Agree"
4 "Agree"
3 "Neither Agree nor Disagree"
2 "Disagree"
1 "Strongly Disagree"
'0' "Do Not Know"

/Q54 TO Q62
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"

/Q63 TO Q67
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"
0 "No Basis to Judge"

/Q68 TO Q69
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"
/Q70 TO Q73
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"
0 “No Basis to Judge”

DLOC
74. Where do you work?
   [A] Headquarters
   [B] Field

DSUPER
75. What is your supervisory status?
   [A] Non-Supervisor: You do not supervise other employees.
   [B] Team Leader: You are not an official supervisor; you provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals.
   [C] Supervisor: You are responsible for employees’ performance appraisals and approval of their leave, but you do not supervise other supervisors.
   [D] Manager: You are in a management position and supervise one or more supervisors.
   [E] Executive: Member of Senior Executive Service or Equivalent.

DSEX
76. Are you:
   [A] Male
   [B] Female

DHISP
77. Are you Hispanic or Latino?
   [A] Yes
   [B] No

DRNO
78. Are you:
   [A] White
   [B] Black or African American
   [C] Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   [D] Asian
   [E] American Indian or Alaska Native
   [F] Two or more races (Not Hispanic or Latino)

DAGEGRP
79. What is your age group?
   [B] 29 and under
   [C] 30-39
   [D] 40-49
   [E] 50-59
   [F] 60 or older

DPAYCAT
80. What is your pay category/grade?
DFEDTEN
81. How long have you been with the Federal Government (excluding military service)?
   [A] Less than 1 year
   [B] 1 to 3 years
   [C] 4 to 5 years
   [D] 6 to 10 years
   [E] 11 to 20 years
   [F] More than 20 years

DAGYTEN
82. How long have you been with your current agency (for example, Department of Justice, Environmental Protection Agency)?
   [A] Less than 1 year
   [B] 1 to 3 years
   [C] 4 to 5 years
   [D] 6 to 10 years
   [E] 11 to 20 years
   [F] More than 20 years

DLEAVING
83. Are you considering leaving your organization within the next year, and if so, why?
   [A] No
   [B] Yes, to retire
   [C] Yes, to take another job within the Federal Government
   [D] Yes, to take another job outside the Federal Government
   [E] Yes, other

DRETIRE

84. I am planning to retire:
   [A] Within one year
   [B] Between one and three years
   [C] Between three and five years
   [D] Five or more years
APPENDIX D: 2008 FEDERAL HUMAN CAPITAL SURVEY
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Q1-Q74

1. The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.
2. I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization.
3. I have enough information to do my job well.
4. I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things.
5. My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment.
6. I like the kind of work I do.
7. I have trust and confidence in my supervisor.
8. I recommend my organization as a good place to work.
9. Overall, how good a job do you feel is being done by your immediate supervisor/team leader?
10. How would you rate the overall quality of work done by your work group?
11. The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals.
12. My supervisor supports my need to balance work and other life issues.
13. Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.
14. My work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills.
15. The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.
16. I have sufficient resources (for example, people, materials, budget) to get my job done.
17. My workload is reasonable.
18. My talents are used well in the workplace.
19. I know how my work relates to the agency’s goals and priorities.
20. The work I do is important.
21. Physical conditions (for example, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well.

22. Promotions in my work unit are based on merit.

23. In my work unit, steps are taken to deal with a poor performer who cannot or will not improve.

24. Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.

25. Employees are rewarded for providing high quality products and services to customers.

26. Creativity and innovation are rewarded.

27. Pay raises depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

28. Awards in my work unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs.

29. In my work unit, differences in performance are recognized in a meaningful way.

30. My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance.

31. Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.

32. In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had to do to be rated at different performance levels (for example, Fully Successful, Outstanding).

33. I am held accountable for achieving results.

34. Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit are committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.

35. Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring).

36. Managers/supervisors/team leaders work well with employees of different backgrounds.

37. I have a high level of respect for my organization’s senior leaders.

38. In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.

39. My organization’s leaders maintain high standards of honesty and integrity.

40. Managers communicate the goals and priorities of the organization.
41. Managers review and evaluate the organization’s progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.

42. Employees are protected from health and safety hazards on the job.

43. My organization has prepared employees for potential security threats.

44. Complaints, disputes or grievances are resolved fairly in my work unit.

45. Arbitrary action, personal favoritism and coercion for partisan political purposes are not tolerated.

46. Prohibited Personnel Practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person’s right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans’ preference requirements) are not tolerated.

47. I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.

48. Supervisors/team leaders provide employees with constructive suggestions to improve their job performance.

49. Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.

50. Employees have electronic access to learning and training programs readily available at their desk.

51. My training needs are assessed.

52. Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, and needed resources).

53. Employees in my work unit share job knowledge with each other.

54. Employees use information technology (for example, intranet, shared networks) to perform work.

55. How satisfied are you with your involvement in decisions that affect your work?

56. How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what’s going on in your organization?

57. How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?

58. How satisfied are you with the policies and practices of your senior leaders?
59. How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?
60. How satisfied are you with the training you receive for your present job?
61. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?
62. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your pay?
63. Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization?
64. How satisfied are you with retirement benefits?
65. How satisfied are you with health insurance benefits?
66. How satisfied are you with life insurance benefits?
67. How satisfied are you with long term care insurance benefits?
68. How satisfied are you with the flexible spending account (FSA) program?
69. How satisfied are you with paid vacation time?
70. How satisfied are you with paid leave for illness (for example, personal), including
   family care situations (for example, childbirth/adoptions or eldercare)?
71. How satisfied are you with child care subsidies?
72. How satisfied are you with work/life programs (for example, health and wellness,
   employee assistance, eldercare, and support groups)?
73. How satisfied are you with telework/telecommuting?
74. How satisfied are you with alternative work schedules?

VALUE LABELS
/Q1 TO Q8
  5 "Strongly Agree"
  4 "Agree"
  3 "Neither Agree nor Disagree"
  2 "Disagree"
  1 "Strongly Disagree"
/Q9 TO Q10
  5 " Very Good"
4 "Good"
3 "Fair"
2 "Poor"
1 "Very Poor"

/Q11 TO Q31
5 "Strongly Agree"
4 "Agree"
3 "Neither Agree nor Disagree"
2 "Disagree"
1 "Strongly Disagree"
X "Do Not Know"

/Q32
5 "Strongly Agree"
4 "Agree"
3 "Neither Agree nor Disagree"
2 "Disagree"
1 "Strongly Disagree"
X "No Basis to Judge"

/Q33 TO Q54
5 "Strongly Agree"
4 "Agree"
3 "Neither Agree nor Disagree"
2 "Disagree"
1 "Strongly Disagree"
X "Do Not Know"

/Q55 TO Q63
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"

/Q64 TO Q68
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"
X "No Basis to Judge"

/Q69 TO Q70
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"

/Q71 TO Q74
5 "Very Satisfied"
4 "Satisfied"
3 "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied"
2 "Dissatisfied"
1 "Very Dissatisfied"
X "No Basis to Judge"

DLOC
75. Where do you work?
   [A] Headquarters
   [B] Field
**DSUPER**

76. What is your supervisory status?
   
   [A] Non-Supervisor: You do not supervise other employees.
   
   [B] Team Leader: You are not an official supervisor; you provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals.
   
   [C] Supervisor: You are responsible for employees’ performance appraisals and approval of their leave, but you do not supervise other supervisors.
   
   [D] Manager: You are in a management position and supervise one or more supervisors.
   
   [E] Executive: Member of Senior Executive Service or Equivalent.

**DSEX**

77. Are you:

   [A] Male
   
   [B] Female

**DHISP**

78. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

   [1] Yes
   
   [2] No

**DRNO**

79. Are you:

   [A] American Indian or Alaska Native
   
   [B] Asian
[C] Black or African American
[D] Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
[E] White
[F] Two or more races (Not Hispanic or Latino)

**DAGEGRP**

80. What is your age group?
   - [B] 29 and under
   - [C] 30-39
   - [D] 40-49
   - [E] 50-59
   - [F] 60 or older

**DPAYCAT**

81. What is your pay category/grade?
   - [B] GS 1-6
   - [C] GS 7-12
   - [D] GS 13-15
   - [E] Senior Executive Service
   - [F] Senior Level (SL) or Scientific or Professional (ST)
   - [G] Other

**DFEDTEN**

82. How long have you been with the Federal Government (excluding military service)?
   - [A] Less than 1 year
   - [B] 1 to 3 years
   - [C] 4 to 5 years
83. How long have you been with your current agency (for example, Department of Justice, Environmental Protection Agency)?
   [A] Less than 1 year
   [B] 1 to 3 years
   [C] 4 to 5 years
   [D] 6 to 10 years
   [E] 11 to 20 years
   [F] More than 20 years

84. Are you considering leaving your organization within the next year, and if so, why?
   [A] No
   [B] Yes, to retire
   [C] Yes, to take another job within the Federal Government
   [D] Yes, to take another job outside the Federal Government
   [E] Yes, other

85. I am planning to retire:
   [A] Within one year
   [B] Between one and three years
[C] Between three and five years

[D] Five or more years
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### LIST OF VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>IDEALIZED INFLUENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>● Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64</td>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>● Discussions with my supervisor/team leader about my performance are worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● How satisfied are you with the information you receive from management on what's going on in your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66</td>
<td>Q58</td>
<td>Q59</td>
<td>● Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit support employee development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>● How satisfied are you with your opportunity to get a better job in your organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Creativity and innovation are rewarded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>● In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65</td>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>● Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● How satisfied are you with the recognition you receive for doing a good job?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>PLE-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>PLE-2</td>
<td>Supervisors/team leaders in my work unit provide employees with the opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>PLE-3</td>
<td>The skill level in my work unit has improved in the past year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>PLE-4</td>
<td>My talents are used well in the workplace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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