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Abstract

This three-phase convergent mixed methods study was designed to assess the multivariate relationships among organizational commitment, organizational engagement, connectedness of organizational members, and emergent leadership behavior in a local community of faith. The first phase was a small set of initial interview questions used to establish the behaviors and activities that promote relationships in the organization. The second phase was a survey used to preform a social network analysis to establish social network measures from relationship data in the church as well as measure the multivariate associations between the dependent and independent variables. The final phase was a more substantial set of interviews to determine and evaluate the leadership narrative in the local congregation. This study showed that organizational engagement, particularly the absorption subscale, displayed a strong correlation with emergent leadership behavior while organizational commitment surprisingly only showed a small positive correlation. Relationships in the church displayed homophilic behavior where organizational members with similar measures in organizational commitment and engagement created or maintained social relationships with each other. But, no homophilic behavior was demonstrated in emergent leadership behavior. The leadership narrative of the church revealed the importance of commitment, engagement, and prototypicality in leaders. Organizational members would give or restrict support based on prototypicality thus emerging leaders are socially encouraged or discouraged to continue developing as leaders.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A change in leadership is often a common solution for organizational problems. Even in religious communities, far too often the first solution is to look for a new and better leader when frustrations, failures, and insufficiencies are observed within the organization. There is an overwhelming emphasis for pastors, ministers, priests and other religious leaders to develop leadership skills to turn the tide and help religious communities as organizations achieve their goals, promote shared values, or protect the communities from moral failings. Unfortunately, in both nonprofit and for-profit environments, followership and the behavior of the organizational members are rarely mentioned as a solution or a means of dealing with frustrations and failures in organizations. However, there are great examples of emergent leadership throughout the history of faith communities where organizational change was initiated by the efforts of engaged and committed followers.

A historic example of leadership emergence in a community of faith, which had lasting impact, includes Augustine of Hippo who shortly after his joining a community of faith wrote extensively on Christianity, philosophy, and the church while avoiding formal leadership appointments (Brown, 1967). His influence and emergent leadership behavior eventually led to an appointment as a bishop in the early church. In the sixteenth century, John Calvin, a lawyer and church layman, authored *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, one of the most influential systematic theologies still used today (Calvin, 1960; Duffield & Battles, 1966). John Wesley and Francis Asbury shaped countless communities of faith on the frontiers of the American English colonies through recognizing emerging
leadership behavior in the laity within communities (González, 2010; Wesley & Outler, 1964). John Wesley would even go as far as to ordain these emerging leaders as Anglican Priests without permission from the Anglican Church thus placing a strong trust and faith in local emerging leaders (González, 2010).

This runs counter to organizational or group leadership literature which is dominated by leader-centered paradigms such as trait theories (Stogdill, 1948), skill theories (Mumford & Connelly, 1992; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000), style approach (Cartwright & Zander, 1960; Likert, 1967) transformational (Bass, 1985, 1991), or servant leadership theory (Greenleaf, 2002). The leader-centric theories often focus around a singular person and what that one person (the leader) is or is not doing. But leadership at its core is relational (Rost, 1991). This relationship requires the action of multiple people in cooperation when some will influence and others willingly accept, comply, or conform to the influence. This study is unique as it attempts to reverse the researcher’s lens and view emerging leadership as a process that occurs from within the ranks of followers based on their satisfaction with the direction of the organization.

At its most fundamental level, leadership allows a person to persuade another to embrace new values, attitudes, and goals, and to exercise an effort to guide another to the acceptance of those values, attitude and goals (Hogg et al., 2006). So leadership is not restricted by a position a person holds in an organization. Leadership can emerge from anyone in an organization. Scholars have recognized that followers are essential in helping leaders to achieve their goals, promote the organizational mission, give accurate feedback, and promote common goals and values, but followers can also lead from informal or social positions in an organization (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Many
relational theories of leadership promote the idea that leader–follower relationships are made up of interdependent and highly connected relations (Lichtenstein et al., 2006; Rost, 1991; Uhl-Bien, 2006). Again, we know leadership is not restricted to a singular one-way relationship of influence moving from the leader to the follower. Current theories take into account a follower’s influence on the leader (Northouse, 2010; Riggio, Chaleff, & Lipman-Blumen, 2008) but neglect the follower’s influence on one another in the leadership process to move organizations closer to meeting their goals and fulfilling their organizational mission.

Meindl recognized this deficiency in his romance of leadership theory (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). The theory is a critique of the current of leadership scholarship that over emphasizes the role of leader in the leadership process. Researchers place their faith in the idea of a heroic, transcendental leader who could achieve almost impossible organizational feats without taking into account the contextual, social, or environmental factors within the organization. Meindl encourages scholars to take an alternate view to studying leadership from the perspective of followers and their social contexts, but this theory still does not completely account for follower-to-follower interaction and influence followers have on one another. According to social network scholars, follower influence could be mapped and accounted for through social network analysis to measure connectedness, guidance, and impact (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). This would in turn allow scholars to take into account the social influences between followers and show how followers influence each other in the leadership process (Mayo & Pastor, 2007).
**Conceptual Approach to Followership**

We intuitively know that followers and followership are essential to understanding leadership but studies of followers as a key component of the leadership process are few (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). This oversight is due to confusion and misunderstanding about followership concepts and constructs and how they relate to leadership. For example, many common stereotypes suggest followers are timid docile sheep who obey the directions and instructions of leaders (Chaleff, 2009). However, followers are partners and are a significant component that drives the leadership process (Kelley, 1992). A larger research agenda is needed to incorporate the follower and the social context to determine the role they play in the leadership process (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Shamir, 2007). Researching followers would assist scholars in a better understanding of the leadership process to determine the role of followers and how context and social relationships contributes to successful organizations and goal achievement through informal leadership.

**Defining followership.** This study is examining the follower and the nature of the followers following in the leadership process. A follower is an organizational or group member that interacts and reports to or accepts the authority and influence of another group member who is designated as a leader (Chaleff, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988, 1992). The process of the follower being influenced and responding to the influence of a leader is followership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The definition views both leadership and followership as a social and dynamic system involving leaders and followers. This suggests that followership can be observed in two ways as a rank (or position), requiring an organizational member to play a role in the leadership process, and
viewing followership as a social process between followers and leaders (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

**Followership as a role.** The role approach sees followers playing a hierarchical role occupying a subordinate position through formal or informal role in the leadership process. From this perspective researchers can examine how followers influence leader attitudes, behaviors, and organizational outcomes thus followers could be seen as causal agents in the leadership process (Shamir, Pillai, Bligh, & Uhl-Bien, 2007). The focus is on the characteristics, behaviors, and traits of the follower and how those shape leaders’ attitudes and behaviors.

**Followership as a social process.** The social process is a co-constructed relational interaction between followers and leaders (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Shamir, 2007). The social process of followership includes the granting behavior that occurs when a person attempts to influence or make positional leadership claims (Shamir, 2011). So, followership is seen as the “following behavior” granting influence, deferring authority, obeying, and resisting a leader’s wishes or influence attempts (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, & McGregor, 2010; DeRue, Nahrgang, & Ashford, 2015). Followership would also include the influence shared between followers in an attempt to influence another to go along with the desires of a leader (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012). This creates a conceptual approach so that followership is not restricted to only a role but to the behavior of the organizational member. This approach also creates the opportunity for managers and leaders to defer to the expertise and knowledge of subordinates and engage in followership behavior themselves.
Followership Theory

The study of followership can have a remarkable impact on what we know about leadership as both a social and relational process and as well as the role followers play on the behaviors, attitude, and characteristics of leaders. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) gives a formal definition of followership theory as “the study of the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process (p. 96).” This includes a follower’s role, behaviors, outcomes connected to the leadership process, and the co-constructed nature between leaders and followers of the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Influence of followers. The follower-leader social construct creates a means by which we can understand the role that followers have in organizational outcome and influence on organizational success (Carsten et al., 2010; Engle & Lord, 1997; Lord & Emrich, 2001). When followers feel like they are participating with leaders or acting as leaders to create change, everyone, including the organization, benefits (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Kohles, Bligh, & Carsten, 2012; Peterson, Walumbwa, Avolio, & Hannah, 2012). Followers also carry a sense of organizational responsibility. Often they are the organization’s best protection for ethical and moral dilemmas created by leaders; a brave follower can prevent, recognize, and stop ethical problems before those problems damage the whole organization through the influence they have with leaders and other followers (Chaleff, 2009; Lapidot, Kark, & Shamir, 2007; Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007; Peterson et al., 2012). But followers are more than relational components within the process of leadership; they are more than team players or watchdogs. Under the right circumstances, groups of followers can function without leaders through their social connections and relationships with their peers to bring about organizational change
(Kickul & Neuman, 2000; Lichtenstein & Plowman, 2009; Plowman et al., 2007; Toor & Ofori, 2008).

**Social construct of followers.** In the past, researchers have reduced the leadership process to a dyadic relationship contained between two people, but organizations are more complicated and more complex than these simple interactions (Goldstein, Hazy, & Lichtenstein, 2010). Human environments are relationally complicated; therefore, the simple traditional command and control systematic flowcharts do not accurately reflect how organizations operate. Just as leadership cannot be restricted solely to a leader influencing a follower, social psychologists that have studied group dynamics know that followers influence each other to create a network of complex human relationships where each person subtly influences one another (Côté, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010; Hogg et al., 2006; C. Smith & Comer, 1994). Human organizations are so complex that even if the best leaders and managers are placed in positions of authority, there is no guarantee of organizational success. Human systems incorporate too many variables and are simply too chaotic to be coordinated by top-down management using universal techniques of authority and influence (Marion, 2008).

**Overlooking followers.** Kelley (1988) states, “Followership dominates our lives and organizations, but not our thinking, because our preoccupation with leadership keeps us from considering the nature in the importance of the follower” (p. 144). But the landscape is changing. The way we view leadership in the wake of the information age, mass communication, and electronic social networks is shifting. Recent events, such as the Arab Spring or the demonstrations on Wall Street, have revealed the power that
committed and engaged followers have to implement change without formal leadership (Marzouki, 2012).

Followers must play a larger role in our understanding of the leadership process. Followers have significant power and influence, and a follower may offer the largest contribution to the success and failure of the organization. Kelley (1992) stated that leaders only contribute about 20% of the productive outcome of any organization. Leaders are directly responsible for a significant portion of organizational success, but the majority rests with those outside the authority of the formal leaders. The contribution followers make to organizational success should be studied and taken into account for anyone to have a complete understanding of the leadership process.

Shamir et al. (2007) have pointed out that while some studies examine followers in the leadership process, most studies only focus on how followers contribute to leader success. Unfortunately, the study of leadership remains leader-centric and the followers are just another variable to account for in leadership process. Kelley (1992), Bocchialetti (1995), Chaleff (2009), and Kellerman (2008) have all attempted to put a stronger emphasis on the follower beyond the simple idea or expected role of blindly following as the subordinate.

**Growing understanding of followership.** Followership is the characteristics, behaviors, and relational processes between followers and leaders as well as individuals responding to a leader’s influence (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The new clearly defined theory of followership will assist researchers in advancing our understanding of the leadership process by establishing the boundaries needed for the study of followership. This followership paradigm creates an opportunity for scholars to better focus research efforts
to understand the characteristics, behaviors, and outcomes of followership that will in turn help leadership scholars understand how leaders and followers interact together in a context to co-create leadership. Followership theory equips researchers to better recognize the influence of followers in an organization, the social construct of leadership between leaders and followers, and establish clear boundaries of followership to recognize the impact followers have in the leadership process.

**Methodology Behind Followership**

The study of followership comes with its own set of general principles that refers to the rationale and the philosophical assumptions about followers. These assumptions determine how and what counts as knowledge to inform the research of followership. As mentioned above the followership theoretical construct pays particular attention to behavior, characteristics, attitudes, and outcomes directly connected to followers. Followership is the study of how followers view and enact following behaviors in relation to leaders (Riggio et al., 2008; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

**Quantitative and qualitative studies.** Boccialetti (1995) wanted to understand followers’ behavior and attitudes from the follower’s point of view. His research focused on the boss and subordinate dyad rather than the more recent terms follower and leader. Boccialetti looks at self-awareness and personal development in various organizations. He uses both quantitative and qualitative research data inviting over seven hundred participants to engage in interviews and self-analysis. He specifically examines the patterns of people's responses to authority relations to determine a more effective, satisfying, and productive relationship with managers and leaders.

Kelley (1992) developed a framework to categorize followers into various types
based on organizational engagement and critical thinking practices of followers, which
would lead to follower commitment. Kelley's instrument is used to assign a typology to
followers and has had some limited use, but unfortunately it has been greatly restricted in
scope because it does not connect a topology of followers with goal attainment outcomes.
Both researchers used qualitative and quantitative methods to understand the behavior,
traits, and attitudes of followers (Boccialetti, 1995; Kelley, 1988, 1992).

He points out that the vast majority of leaders are expected to follow or answer to other
leaders, so everyone should embrace their responsibility and commitment to the
organization through courageous actions as followers, even challenging leaders when the
situation dictates. Kellerman (2008) offered a different approach to study followers; her
research looked at historic events and assigned followers types based on the follower’s
self-empowerment and level of engagement to the organization’s collective and shared
goals. Chaleff takes a meta-analysis approach, borrowing from the work of many
scholars, and Kellerman takes a classic qualitative approach in her research to better
understand behaviors and characteristics that can have a significant impact on
organizational outcomes.

The study of followers and followership creates the opportunity to collect
different types of data in a study using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Often,
quantitative methods are associated with positivism while qualitative is associated with
post-positivism (McGregor & Murnane, 2010). Followership studies lend themselves to
be both qualitative and quantitative expanding the opportunities to collect a broad range
and different types of data that can inform not just the what, where, and when but also the
why and how of a follower’s behavior. Collecting both types of data allow for a more complete and richer understanding to examine the characteristics, behaviors, and styles of followers and followership.

The scholars and researchers mentioned above Kelley, Boccialetti, Chaleff, and Kellerman, use both qualitative and quantitative methods to categorize followers to better understand their actions and behaviors in an organizational context; however, the significant weakness of each of these studies is their restricted attempt to study followers as individuals instead of as a collective group of organizational members that are influenced by relational social pressures. It is within the collective of group members where we can observe how the social and relational dynamics influence followers to implement change in their organizations.

**Social network analysis.** Researchers have neglected the role of followers in the leadership process as well as the ability for followers to emerge as group leaders from within the social construct of organizational members to bring about organizational change in the absence of formal leadership. Social network analysis is a set of methodological tools using both qualitative and quantities techniques to understand the relationships and structures within a network of relationships among organizational members (R. L. Cross & Parker, 2004). This approach views social relationships in terms of network theory where individual actors within the network are represented as nodes, and the relationships between the individuals are represented as ties connecting the organizational members together into a network based on the relationships among the organizational members (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Over the past decade, the theory of networks yielded explanations for many social phenomena in a wide variety of areas,
ranging from organizational networks and information sharing, over the use of social media, politics, terrorist networks, and knowledge sharing (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). Most recently, social network analysis has also been established as a well-suited technique to study leadership in organizations for three reasons: (1) it models patterns of relationships among interconnected individuals like followers; (2) it can reflect how leadership is distributed and used among organizational members; and (3) it also can isolate the emergence of multiple leaders within a group (Emery, Calvard, & Pierce, 2013).

Researchers should be able to identify relationships between emergent leader identification, organizational engagement, organizational commitment, and the relational-social patterns to show how these variables can create the greatest possibility of emergent leadership behavior among followers. However, to this date, this assumption has yet to be empirically tested.

Though we recognize the importance of followers, addressing the significant gap in the current research could aid us in understanding how followers affect relationship formation within their organizations and how other followers influence emerging leadership in the organization. In this study, I suggest that followers’ commitment, engagement, and connectedness play a crucial role in emergence of leadership among organizational members which can directly influence religious communities’ abilities to achieve their goals, to promote shared values, and to protect the community.

**Research Problem**

Much of the scholarly work done on followership is thinly spread across a broad time span and many different professional journals (Crossman & Crossman, 2011;
Only a few researchers have taken on the challenge of looking at the leadership process through the eyes of a follower (Popper, 2011; Riggio et al., 2008). The result has been a stark reminder that there is more to leadership than just the leader. Unfortunately, the research conducted on what causes followers to take personal responsibility for an organization’s goals and values is often found in anecdotal stories or overly simplified lists of expectations of follower behavior or social reminders that followers should “fall in line” with everyone else (Chaleff, 2009). Ultimately, we know very little about the qualities and characteristics of followers that lead to emergent leadership behavior.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of three-phase convergent design mixed methods study is to assess the multivariate relationships among organizational commitment, organizational engagement, connectedness of organizational members and emergent leadership behavior in a local community of faith. The first phase is a small set of initial interviews to establish what behaviors and activities promote relationships in the organization. The second phase is a survey used to preform a social network analysis to establish social network measures from relationship data in the church as well as measure the multivariate associations between the dependent and independent variables. The final phase is a more substantial set of interviews to determine and evaluate the leadership narrative of the local congregation. This study uses a convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data.

The convergence of data types allows both types of collected data to provide different insights and allows the study to examine the problem from multiple angles as
well as perspectives (Creswell, 2015). This study has been divided into three phases to simplify the data collection procedures and to keep the complex components of the study contained in three sections for easy reporting.

**Research Questions**

Looking at the relationships followers have with their organizations through organizational engagement, organizational commitment, and the social context of followers in the organization adds to the current followership research through focusing on emergent leadership behavior among followers. The following questions are used as a guide to shape the research and hypotheses of this study.

1. How does a follower’s organizational commitment and organizational engagement influence the likelihood of assuming roles of informal leadership in the organization?

2. Does emerging leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and/or organizational engagement influence the development of the organization’s social network?

3. How do followers hinder or promote emergent leadership behavior in each other through their social context within the organization?

**Additional Theories Guiding Research**

Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) broad view of followership theory creates two theoretical frames to study followership, one from a role-based perspective examining the traits, behaviors, and characteristics of followers but also creates a constructionists approach to examine the leadership process. This study looks at the characteristics of followers from a role-based approach but it also examines the relationships between leader and followers
as well as the relationships between followers in an organization from a constructionist approach. This study examines both relationship and traits of followers to better understand leader emergent behavior.

**Emergent Leadership Theory**

Emergent leadership research examines how members of organizational groups create social structure, share expertise, and achieve common goals without formal leadership hierarchy (Ho, Shih, & Walters, 2012; Mann, 1959). Emergent leaders are group members that initially hold equal status with peers but exhibit high levels of leadership behavior and thus achieve higher status in the collective conceptualization of the social order (Berdahl, 1996). While some groups make emergent leaders into a pseudo formal leadership structure in the group, the dynamic social processes among the group members creates the social structure that allows emergent leadership to occur in the larger organization (Berdahl, 1996).

In traditional hierarchal organizations, an individual is assigned or given responsibility for the completion of jobs and tasks as well as the results of the group’s performance. However, in groups without formal leadership, team members can share the responsibility for goal attainment and organizational performance. Leadership is still practiced as a dynamic social group process when there is no designated leader. Leaders often emerge from the collective when individual expertise is recognized and context necessitates the need for informal leadership (Neubert & Taggar, 2004; Taggar, Hackew, & Saha, 1999). In most cases, no particular tangible reward exists for the emerging leader in the group because each member is expected to share rewards and responsibilities through collective achievement (Taggar et al., 1999).
Leadership researchers have shown that in the context of organizations, groups, or teams, individual groups members with no formal authority often provide leadership, inspiration, and motivation for the group (J. A. Smith & Foti, 1998; Walter, Cole, der Vetg, Rubin, & Bommer, 2012). Emergent leadership is also known to influence important team processes and outcomes (Bass & Stogdill, 1990), and researchers have attempted to better understand the factors that encourage or predict leader emergence in a group such as cognitive ability, emotional intelligence, and personality (Chaturvedi, Zyphur, Arvey, Avolio, & Larsson, 2012; Emery, 2012; Foti & Hauenstein, 2007). These factors contribute to our understanding of why some individuals are more or less likely to be regarded as leaders by other group members (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986).

This study proposes that social relationships affect group members and encourage some members to emerge from the group to be recognized by the other group members as an informal and emerging leader. Based on the work of Kelley (1992), Chaleff (2009), and Kellerman (2008) the followers who are committed to their organizations and engaged with their organizations should be strong candidates for leadership emergence and informal leadership.

**Social Network Theory**

If followers emerge as group leaders from within the social construct of an organization in the absence of formal leadership then the relationships between followers must be taken into account when studying followers in the leadership process. The social construct within the organization is the means by which organizational members influence each other. Social network theories and social network analyses are used as methodological tools (both qualitative and quantitative) to understand those relationships.
and social structures that make up the social network of organizational members and examine how those social networks affect individuals in the organization (R. L. Cross & Parker, 2004). The social structure of the organization can be examined by looking at the strength of relationships between people and examine how those relationships influence follower behavior like leadership emergence.

Social network theory addresses the social structure of groups by looking at the relationships (or ties) between people (sometimes called nodes) (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Each person occupies a social space within a social network and the relationships between people connect those people together within the group. Many kinds of relationships can be monitored between individuals such as trust, friendship, advice, kinship, etc. (Scott, 2013). So, the simplest form of a social network is a map or graph of all of the ties being studied in a group. The network can be used to determine the social capital, influence, connectivity, and social distance of each person in a group or organization (Huggins, Johnston, & Thompson, 2012; Lin, 1999). These networks are often displayed in a social network diagram called sociograms, where nodes are the points on the diagram and ties are the lines between the people or points in the group. Some social networks are so large that social network diagrams are not feasible or good representations of information because the magnitude of information that is being used to represent the social connections clutters the diagram to the point that relationships and people cannot be distinguished from each other. Large social networks are often represented in a mathematical matrix that represents the relationships in the network.

Social network analyses are a set of techniques that examines the network and structure of relationships and establishes quantitative values for the people and
relationships in the network. Values assigned to relationships distinguish between strong and weaker relationships among peers. Other measures can be calculated to create measurements of centrality for each person in the network such as node degree (how many connections a person has in the network), eigenvector centrality (how many and how important are the connections a person has in the network), and ego network density (how connected are a person’s friends to each other in the network.) Each value is used to compare or to correlate to other quantitative traits connected to people within the network.

Traditional sociological ideas assume that attributes of individuals create the social structure in a group (Burt, 1984). However, social network theory produces an alternate view, where the attributes of individuals are less important to group dynamics than the relationships people form within the network (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006; Johnson & Miller, 1983). Social network theory explains many real-world phenomena as a result of a group’s social structure or the structure of their network, while still leaving room for individual agency, the ability for individuals to influence their success.

Social network theory allows this study to move beyond the limited view of individual and dyadic relationships so often studied in leadership research, and incorporates the social psychological influences within the group’s structure. The social network research looks at the culmination of the relational ties to determine how peer relationships may influence the emergence of leadership and followers (S. Oh, 2012). A general network theory predicts that a person’s position in a social network determines the constraints and opportunities he or she will encounter; therefore, network position is important in determining a person’s ability to influence and lead the rest of the group.
(Borgatti, Everett, & Johnson, 2013). Social network analysis can be used to study the effects that an individual’s beliefs and values have on another within the social network, and will converge into the views and values of the larger group which will impact the behaviors in the group to the extent they have proximity and exposure to others in their network (Marsden & Friedkin, 1993). The social processes inside larger organizations can allow or restrict the emergence of informal leadership (J. A. Smith & Foti, 1998).

**Development of Hypothesis**

Chaleff (2009), Kellerman (2008), and Kelley (1988, 1992), whose work is foundational to the study of how followers affect the leadership process, all point to organizational commitment and the follower’s organizational engagement as foundational to understanding the role of followers in leadership. Followers that display high measures of organizational engagement and organizational commitment seem to be good candidates to demonstrate the behaviors that would make them informal leaders or at least followers that would emerge from their peers as leaders to support the larger organization.

To this point, little empirical evidence supports the core tenets of these seminal theories, which express what characteristics make good followers in an organization, and no studies show how followers affect the emergence of leadership through organizational engagement and organizational commitment. I am measuring the connection among member organizational engagement, organizational commitment, and emergent leadership in the organization to determine the relationship between these measures and how social structures influence emerging informal leaders.
I am also examining emergent leadership behavior of followers within the social structure of a community of faith. Emergent leaders are defined as group members who exert significant influence over other members of the group even though no formal authority has been vested in them (Schneider & Goktepe, 1983). Emergent leader identification is to be done by both self-reported and peer-reported nomination and will be studied as the dependent variables while the independent variables are social network analysis metrics such as node degree, eigenvector centrality, ego network density (Kilduff & Tsai, 2003; Scott, 2013; Wasserman & Faust, 1994), organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979), and organizational engagement (Saks, 2006). Figure 1.1 shows an overview of the hypotheses, variables, tests, and followership theory frameworks in the design of this study.
Figure 1.1 Hypothesis Development

**Hypothesis**

The first set of hypotheses is restricted to identifying the relationship between organizational commitment (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), organizational engagement (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002), and self-reported leader emergence behavior using five items from the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994). Past research has shown positive relationship between
organizational commitment and organizational engagement but no studies show how both measures correlate with leader emergence behavior (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014).

**H₁a**: Organizational commitment will have a positive relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior. That is, the higher the commitment to the organization, the higher the self-reported leader emergence behavior.

**H₁b**: Organizational engagement will have a positive relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior. That is, the higher the engagement in the organization, the higher the self-reported leader emergence behavior.

**H₁c**: Organizational commitment and organizational engagement will have a significant multivariate relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior.

The second set of hypotheses introduces the social network measures including homophily. One of the major areas of inquiry in social network analysis is the formation and maintenance of relationships in networks. Humans have a tendency to cluster with similar or like-minded people (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). It is reasonable to assume that the way people feel about their organizations could determine with whom they form relationships in the network or those relationships could influence followers’ attitudes about the organization. Identifying these homophilic groups could be a good source of information to identify clusters and social patterns where social forces such as peer expectations could assist or hinder people as emerging leaders (J. A. Smith & Foti, 1998).

**H₂a**: Organizational members who display high measures in organization commitment will tend to be adjacent (or close) to one another in the organizational network. So, members with high organization commitment will demonstrate group homophily.

**H₂b**: Organizational members who display high measures in organization engagement will tend to be adjacent (or close) to one another in the organizational network. So, members with high organization engagement will demonstrate group homophily.

**H₂c**: Organizational members who display high measures in self-reported emergent leader identification will tend to be socially distant from one another in the organizational
network. So, members with high self-reported emergent leader identification would not demonstrate group homophily.

The final set of hypotheses looks at social network measures and leader emergence behavior. According to researchers of leadership network theory, formal and informal leaders are expected to show high embeddedness and a tendency to enter into exchange interactions with networks of interpersonal relationships (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). Embeddedness and high frequency use of interpersonal relationships should also result in high-density ego networks (large frequency of social connections between the immediate connections of any individual member), high degree (total amount of social connections any individual members has in the network), and high eigenvector, which is a measurement of influence through relationships in the network (Hoppe & Reinelt, 2010).

\( H_{3a} \): Organizational members with high density ego networks will demonstrate a positive relationship with peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the higher ego networks density the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

\( H_{3b} \): Organizational members with high degree will demonstrate a positive relationship with peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the higher degree the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

\( H_{3c} \): Organizational members with strong eigenvector centrality measures will demonstrate a stronger peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the stronger eigenvector centrality measures the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

**Methodologies and Data Collection Procedures**

This complementary mixed methods study uses a three-phase convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data. The first phase is a small set of interviews to establish what behaviors and activities promote relationships in the
church. The second phase is a survey used to clarify and assess the multivariate relationships among organizational commitment, organizational engagement, and emergent leadership behavior in a local community of faith. The second phase survey will also collect relational data to be used in a social network analysis of the organization to examine how relationships influence followers to encourage or restrict leader emergence behavior within their social context. The final phase uses a substantial set of interviews to evaluate the leadership narrative of the local congregation.

The first phase will involve an introductory interview with four organizational members, followed by a network survey, and then concluded by interviewing organizational members that are most central in the organization’s network to better understand social influences in the organization. Together, all three-phases will give a more complete understanding of how a group member’s organizational commitment and organizational engagement contribute to leader emergence behavior.

**Population and Sample**

The population being studied is made up of members of a medium community of faith in the south-central part of the United States. Both formal members and regular attendees of the church will be asked to participate in this study. The organizational leaders will provide a roster of names, addresses, and emails to establish the contact list of participants. Only organizational members over 18 years of age will be asked to participate to avoid any complications from guardian/parent participation and consent forms. The expected population should be between 150 to 225 females and males over the age of 18. This specific organization has four salaried leaders and 250 members in their organization according to their 2013 yearly statistical report (N~210).
A community of faith offers several unique opportunities to study relationships and leadership in an organization. First, communities of faith have a minimal formal leadership structure compared to businesses and other nonprofit organizations, which allows for many opportunities for leadership emergence behavior. Second, communities of faith are highly relational and are not subject to forced categorizations such as departments, branches, or divisions that must be accounted for in other organizations. This social environment provides members opportunity to associate with any other member; there are no organizational structural boundaries. Third, I am very familiar with the formal elected positional leader structure of this community of faith. This will be very helpful when interpreting the effects of committee membership, social activities and the tasks shared among members of the organization. Finally, access to the organization will be easier to obtain than other organizations due to prior experiences I have had with the organization’s formal leaders. However, I have no personal or relational ties to the organization or the organization’s population.

Phase One – Initial Interviews

The specific types of relationships valued in the church must be established in order to measure the strength of relationships that make up the social network in the church. This minor ethnographic inquiry reveals the types of relationships that are most valued by the members of the church and establishes the social connections between members (for example family ties, advice, trust, friendship, etc.) So, before any quantitative relational data can be collected from a survey, initial interviews will be set up to determine which relationships are valued by the community and should be used in developing the relational composite that will be the foundation for the social network.
relationships. Two formal and two informal leaders within the organization will be asked to participate in a short 25-minute semi-structured interview. The following questions will establish the protocol for the interviews.

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?

2. Please list for me some of the people that you are closest to in this organization?

<List generation>

3. From the list of people you gave me, can you describe the relationship that you have with each person? <Go through each person they listed asking to carefully and specifically define that specific type of relationship>

4. How and when were each of these relationships formed? <Go back through the list>

5. Are there any others you would like to add to this list?

Interviews will be recorded, transcribed, coded, and the digital recordings deleted after transcripts are completed. All information collected from the interviews will be kept under password protection for a minimum of three years on the researcher’s computer. After completion of the interviews, the primary and secondary valued relationship types will be determined using a values coding technique that identifies participant’s values, attitudes, and beliefs, representing their perspective of relationship types that contribute to the relationships in the organization (Saldaña, 2013). Value coding is appropriate when researchers are exploring cultural values, identity, and interpersonal experiences and actions (Saldaña, 2013).
After the interviews are transcribed, the participants’ accounts are categorized as statements reflecting personal value, attitude, or belief about the relationships in the church. For example, a participant may reflect on behaviors and characteristics that are expected from friendships in the local church. These accounts are sorted into major categories and then subgroups are created from the value, attitude, and belief categories. After categorization, the statements are analyzed and interpreted to determine their collective meaning, interaction, and interplay working under the premise that the friendship and relational constructs are a part of an interconnected belief system the group shares. So, the values and ideas that the individual holds about relationships are influenced and affected by the social and cultural networks to which he or she belongs. Differential association is a sociological theory that promotes people’s values are influenced by their social group (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). By conducting several interviews, patterns begin to emerge that are reflective of the group collective ideas about relationships and not just the individual participant. The collected and coded information is used to determine the valued relationship type that establishes the network ties used in identifying the social connections, which creates the organization’s informal social structure. These relationship types are used in the electronic survey instrument to establish relational ties between organizational members.

**Phase Two – Survey**

The second phase of the research is to collect data through the use of a survey of community members to gather demographic data and to establish members’ organizational commitment and engagement to correlate with self-reported leader emergence behavior. The survey will be constructed and data will be collected using the
Variables. The survey in phase two of this study focuses on collecting measurements of three variables: organizational commitment, organizational engagement, and leadership emergence behavior. The purpose of the second phase is to correlate organizational commitment and engagement with leadership emergence behavior in a local community of faith.

Leadership emergence behavior research examines how groups without formal leadership structure display leadership roles and functions where group members create organizational structure, share expertise, and achieve shared goals of the collective (Ho et al., 2012; Mann, 1959). Emergent leaders are group members that initially hold equal status with peers but exhibit high levels of leadership behavior and thus achieve higher status in the collective conceptualization of the social order (Berdahl, 1996). Leadership emergence can be recognized through both the group and the dyadic member perceptions of other group members (Berson, Dan, & Yammarino, 2006; Gershenoff & Foti, 2003; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984) as well as by observers external to the group (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Guastello, 2007). Emergent leadership behavior is identified through
vision, inspiration, and goal setting activities measured by the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale creating the continuous dependent variable in this study (Conger & Kanungo, 1994).

Organizational commitment (OC) refers to a group member’s feelings about the organization. It is the psychological bond an individual has with his or her organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Empirical evidence shows that people's sense of affective commitment with a group or organization could be a crucial factor which determines whether or not they will behave in terms of the collective expectation of the group members (Ellemers, 2012). This supports the general notion that organizational commitment can be an important predictor of an individual’s willingness to emerge as a leader for the greater good of the group. The organizational commitment measure is established as the first continuous independent variable in this study.

Organizational engagement (OE) is “the harnessing of organizational member’s selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employed and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). Organizational commitment is a different construct - it is characterized as a state rather than an attitude; it is the employee's relationship with the organization and has implications for a member's decision to continue or discontinue membership with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Organizational engagement “is experienced as enthusiasm and self-involvement with a task or collective (for example an organization), is fostered by a corresponding dispositional orientation and facilitating climate, and manifests itself in proactive value directed behavior” (Meyer, Gagne, & Parfyonova,
The organizational engagement measure is established as the second continuous independent variable in this study.

**Survey instrument.** The phase two survey will focus on organizational commitment and engagement. Organizational commitment will be measured using the 18-item commitment scale developed for the three-component model of commitment consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1993). In this study, the organizational commitment measure will utilize a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The coefficient alpha for the affective commitment scale is .87 (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Some recent examples from a study of hospital workers gave a coefficient alpha of .75 (Colquitt, LePine, Piccolo, Zapata, & Rich, 2012) and a workforce study of local government authorities in Wales gave a coefficient alpha of .84 (Messersmith, Patel, Lepak, & Gould-Williams, 2011).

The organizational engagement survey, designed to measure enthusiasm and self-involvement with a task or collective, was originally created to measure the engagement of employees in a hired relationship. Studies have shown that engaged employees have a sense of energetic and affective connection with their organization and activities (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Internal consistencies of this instrument typically range between .80 and .90 (Schaufeli et al., 2006).
This instrument has also been used with minor modifications for organizational member in a nonemployee relationship with strong success (Schaufeli et al., 2002). For example, the instrument gave a coefficient alpha of 0.84 when the instrument was modified for a student university relationship (Schaufeli et al., 2002) which has strong relationship similarities to the organizational member and their community of faith. The 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale will be used in this study to determine the organizational engagement measures utilizing a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”

The second phase of the study will also use five items from the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) to identify leader emergence behavior. Participants are asked to rate the extent to which each of the five items is characteristic of how they see themselves participating within the organization. The second phase of this study will also use the same scale and allow peer evaluation of leader emergence behavior. The Conger and Kanungo's scale is used because it assesses the degree of leadership emergence as a continuous variable rather than a discrete phenomenon. This scale also enables the researcher to identify multiple emergent leaders in each group rather than a single leader or a predetermined number of leaders. The use of this instrument is identical to the (Côté et al., 2010) study of 138 undergraduate students in a commerce program enrolled in an organizational behavior course that reported an internal consistency of .98. The original instrument reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .81 (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000) and has shown a range varying from 0.88 to 0.91 (Conger & Kanungo, 1994). This study measures leader emergence behavior utilizing a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “very uncharacteristic” to “very characteristic.”
**Data analysis for phase two.** After survey collection, a descriptive analysis will be conducted for organizational commitment, engagement and self-reported leadership emergence behavior. This initial analysis will include means, standard deviations, and ranges of scores as well as reliability and internal consistency checks. The R statistical software package: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (Team, 2014) will be used to determine Pearson correlations among all three variables. Multiple regression techniques are used to explain the value of a dependent variable when two or more independent variables are present in a study. The multiple regression techniques used in this study will examine the contribution of organizational commitment and organizational engagement with leader emergence behavior. The stepwise forward method adds the independent variables to the equation one variable at a time. The order in which the variables are added is dependent on which independent variable most strongly reduces variance with the dependent variable. The stepwise backward method begins with entering all variables into the equation and removing each variable or sub variable one at a time based on non-significances in the equation. These techniques are used to create accurate models to give partial explanation of leader emergent behavior taking into account the independent variables, organizational commitment and organization engagement.

**Social network analysis**

The second component of the second phase of this study is a social network analysis of the organization to examine how relationships encourage or restrict leader emergence behavior. As mentioned earlier it is essential to do some ethnographic background research to examine the relationship types to appropriately identify and label
terms to be used in the questionnaires (Wellman, 1988). The social network analysis is often viewed as a mixed method on its own and the method is normally comprised of three parts, an initial interview (conducted as phase one of this study) to determine valued relationships, relational survey to determine who is relationally connected to whom, and an interpretive interview as a reliability check for data collection (conducted with phase-three of this study) (Borgatti et al., 2013; J. E. Cross, Dickmann, Newman-Gonchar, & Fagan, 2009). The quantitative data, collected through the relational survey, are analyzed to examine the network ties, such as centrality and social patterns (Burt, 1984; Burt, Jannotta, & Mahoney, 1998; Casciaro, 1998).

**Relational survey.** This component is the second part of the survey and is administered to determine relationships and strength of relationships between the organizational members. This survey component consists of three sections. First, the survey asks participants to identify who they know from a roster of members provided by organizational leaders, which are referred to as weak ties. The survey then asks participants to identify the strong ties they have with other organizational members through the predetermined valued relationships based on the initial interviews. The last section of the relational survey asks participants to evaluate members they nominated using the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale. For example, the survey would look like this:

1. Consider this list of individuals. Who do you know and whom do you feel knows you?

<Select names from prebuilt roster provided by the community of faith>
2. Consider the following list of individuals you selected. Choose between 3 and 15 individuals that you have a close friendship with (you can include family, friends, and working relationships). You will answer a series of quick questions for each individual you nominate.

3. For each individual you selected from above. Please evaluate the following statements about <Name>. (Using a seven-point Likert Scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree) “I trust this person,” “This person energizes me,” “I go to this person for advice,” “I consider this person a personal friend,” “I feel this person understands the needs of <community of faith>.” Additionally, the participant will also report leader emergence behavior for each of their nominated members using the five-item the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale to create a peer-reported leadership emergence behavior score.

Relational survey data will be analyzed using UCINET for Windows: Software for Social Network Analysis (Borgatti, Everett, & Freeman, 2002). Based on the data provided by participants, the social network will be constructed through identification of strong and weak ties and be used to calculate network measures such as centrality, homophily, density, and eigenvector values for each participant. These network measures will be used to determine each individual’s position in the organizational social network. Positional data are correlated with leader emergence scores from the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale to identify network patterns of leader emergence behavior and if homophily is present in the network.
**Variables.** The first variable measured in the second phase of this study is the peer-reported leader emergence behavior. This is an identical instrument to the self-report measure in phase two of this study. Leader emergence behavior is identified through vision, inspiration, and goal setting measured by the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale thus creating a similar continuous dependent variable for phase two in this study.

The second set of variables is the network measures established through the social network analysis. Centrality values will form the bulk of the measures and are the network variables that represent a person’s prominence, opportunities, or status in the organization’s network. Degree centrality is the number of ties or relationships an individual has with other members in the network; an individual with more ties could be more influential and considered more central in the network. Degree centrality ties to the distribution idea of leadership in a network, the more relationships a leader has the more people they can potentially influence in their organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). Degree centrality can be further separated into indegree, those people that look to a leader to lead, and outdegree, which could represent the people a leader relies on to influence and make changes in the organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006).

Network density is the number of ties in a network or subgroup in proportion to the total possible number of ties (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). This measurement is the amount of overall connectedness of a group and can be a strong indicator of trust and influence among the group members. In this study, a high density could reflect the social processes in the group so that the denser a group is the more social influence could occur that would encourage a group member to display emergent leadership behavior or constrain them from emerging as a leader.
Eigenvector of geodesic distances is used to establish network importance of organizational members. The eigenvector approach is an attempt to identify the most central actors or those with the smallest farness from others in terms of the global or overall structure of the network, and to simultaneously establish less value to social patterns that are more local to the organizational member in the network. This measure is a good indicator of the network importance of an individual through the relationships they have in the network (Borgatti et al., 2013).

Homophily is the principle that relationships between similar people occur at a higher rate than dissimilar people (Borgatti et al., 2013). These relationships suggest that social characteristics such as leadership behavior translate into network distance. Using the network ties and participant reported attributes of emergent leadership behavior; this study could reveal the presence of homophily in the network.

**Data analysis.** UCINET (Borgatti et al., 2002) is a statistical software package used to evaluate social networks and report a series of network and organizational values that create measures for each individual in the network. UCINET also has the capability to evaluate global measures of the network including density and homophily, the tendency for members to form close relationships with similar or like members. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (Team, 2014) will be used to determine basic Pearson correlations statistical measures between network variables and both the self- and peer-reported leadership emergence behavior.

The two measures, Moran's I and Geary's C, are adapted for social network analysis from their origins in geography, where they were developed to measure the extent to which the similarity of the geographical features of any two places was related.
to the spatial distance between them. The Moran I ranges from -1.0 as a perfect negative correlation through 0 (no correlation) to +1.0 which would be a perfect positive correlation. The Moran I statistic is constructed like a Pearson correlation coefficient. It indexes the product of the differences between the scores of two actors and the mean, then it weights the actor's similarity as a covariance weighted by the closeness of actors. This sum is taken in ratio to the variance in the scores of all actors from the mean. The resulting measure, like the correlation coefficient, is a ratio of covariance to variance, and has a conventional interpretation. From Moran’s I, it can be determined if organizational members display homophily in their relationship formation across the whole social network. Also by using the different attributes measured (organizational commitment, engagement, peer and self-reported leader emergence behavior, and the social network map) this study will determine which variables correlated to relationship formation across the organization. For example, in this network are leaders more likely to form strong relationships with other leaders or form ties with members with lower leader emergence behavior scores?

The Geary C statistic is described in the geo-statistics literature as being more sensitive to local differences than to global differences. The Geary C statistic examines the differences between the scores of actors, and weights this score by the adjacency or proximity of each pair. The Moran I statistic is constructed by looking at differences between each actor's score and the mean, and weighting the cross products. The differences in the approaches mean that the Geary C statistic is more focused on how different members of each pair are from each other or the local difference; the Moran I statistic is focused on how similar or dissimilar each pair are to the overall average which
forms a difference from global network perspective. The Geary statistic has a value of 1.0 when there is no association. And values less than 1.0 indicate a positive association, values greater than 1.0 indicate a negative association. By using the different attributes measured in this study (organizational commitment, engagement, peer and self-reported leader emergence behavior, and the social network map) this study can determine which variables correlate to relationship formation between the members in the organization.

**Phase Three – Interpretive Interviews**

After the survey data are collected and analyzed, a second set of interviews will be completed to allow selected organizational members opportunity to share personal perceptions of the organizational leadership narrative with the researcher and establish meaning behind the collected quantitative data created from the electronic surveys to elaborate on their experiences of leadership in the organization (Borgatti et al., 2013). Ten to fifteen organizational members will be asked to participate in a medium length interview, 45-60 minutes. Degree centrality, determined through the social network analysis, and peer nominated emergent leadership behavior will be used to select the organizational members for the interviews. Degree centrality is a reflection of the scope of leadership influence the member may have within the organization (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). The following protocols for the interviews will follow the same pattern as the initial interviews. Interviews will be recorded, transcribed, coded, and the digital recordings deleted after transcripts are completed.

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?

2. Could you list for me some of the people you are closest to in this organization?
3. From the people you listed, who would you say are leaders in the organization?

4. How do those you have listed stand out from other organizational members?

5. Can you share with me some activities or behaviors each person you have identified has done to establish him or her as a leader?

6. Is there anything you would like to share with me about any of the people you identified in the organization?

The final set of interviews will be used to add meaning and give a fuller and richer understanding to the set of data used to draw conclusions. Data collected in this portion of the social network analysis look to identify specific organizational member behavior recognized as emerging leadership behavior. This allows me to connect the Conger–Kanungo Leadership scores to witnessed leadership behavior. Again, the second round of interview data can also be used as a validity check for the network survey results. This creates an opportunity to test the results of the social network analysis against insider knowledge and examine the validity of the social network map from an organizational member’s point of view.

The final interview set will be transcribed and coded to identify leadership behavior in organizational members that do not hold formal leadership positions in the organization. The second set of interview data will be analyzed using evaluation coding technique (Saldaña, 2013). The technique uses non-quantitative codes that assign judgment about merit and worth or significance of leadership activity in social network structure. Evaluation coding is appropriate for policy, action, organizational, and evaluation studies (Saldaña, 2013).
This evaluation coding procedure uses a similar technique as the values coding method used in the previous set of interviews from phase one – participants’ statements are categorized into topics, sub topics, and based on accounts reflecting a personal value, attitude, or belief about leadership and leadership experiences in the local church. The evaluation coding adds an additional level of analysis by noting the magnitude of the participants’ reflections. So an additional level of subcoding is added to label each of the participants’ reflections as a positive or negative. Participant suggestions and ideas of general improvements are also labeled separately as recommendations. This category is especially valuable because it reflects each participant’s experiences and his or her recommendations are taken into account utilizing the participant’s own critical and analytical evaluations of specific personnel, events, and leadership experiences within the organization. Four distinct processes are used to make sense of the collected data: analysis of patterns, interpretation of significance, judgment of results, and recommendations. The goal in evaluation coding is to determine what is working and what is not, and to give an overall idea of the collective narrative of how leadership is functioning or not functioning in the church. Recommendations from participants will be collected from the interviews and all personal identifiers will be removed and given to the formal leaders of the church to assist them in leadership development.

Definition of Terms

Leadership – From Conger and Pearce (2003) “a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both. This influence process often
involves peer, or lateral, influence and at other times involves upward or downward hierarchical influence” (p. 1).

*Followership* – is a relational role in which group members have the ability to influence leaders and contribute to the improvement and attainment of group and organizational objectives. It is primarily a hierarchical upward influence (Carsten et al., 2010). It is an affective and cognitive process that determines style, emphasizes attributes and modifies behavior to interact with, influence, or cooperate with the formal or designated leader (Chaleff, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1992; Lord & Emrich, 2001).

*Organizational Commitment* – Neale and Northcraft (1991) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization” (p. 290). This definition allows for group identity and membership through member self-selection and is not restricted to being hired or placed in a group or organization and expected to be committed. Therefore, commitment is a social construct and not a positional expectation.

*Organizational Engagement* – a distinct and unique construct that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components that is associated with individual roles in an organization and a member’s performance in that organization. It is important to understand that engagement is distinguishable from other related constructs, such as organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job involvement (Saks, 2006).

*Social Network* – are the contacts, ties, and connections between individual members in an established group. Relationships are not the properties of individuals but are the
property of the larger relational system and system of individual themselves (Scott, 2013).

Homophily – the principle that contact between similar people occurs at a higher rate than among dissimilar people, it also implies that distance in terms of social characteristics translates into network distance. Essentially it states “birds of a feather flock together” (Borgatti et al., 2013; McPherson et al., 2001; Scott, 2013).

Follower – an organizational or group member that interacts and reports to or accepts the authority and influence of another group member who is designated as a leader (Chaleff, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988, 1992).

Leader – an organizational or group member that interacts and influences other group members through positional and social authority (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Contractor, DeChurch, Carson, Carter, & Keegan, 2012; Day, Gronn, & Salas, 2004).

Emergent Leadership – represents the degree to which a person who is not in a formal position of authority influences the other members of a group. Emergent leadership is flexible and dynamic, so that any member can provide leadership on a specific task. Leadership emergence reflects the degree to which any member can exert influence in the group (Côté et al., 2010).

Limitations

The majority of this study is formed around both a postmodern and a post-positivistic view and attempts to deconstruct social roles, specifically the leader-follower roles, to demonstrate the fluidity and transparency of how leaders emerge within social constructs. The scope of this study will lack much of the qualitative narratives behind why people emerge as leaders in their social groups. While this study does include a
qualitative component, it may be considered thin compared to other larger, descriptive qualitative leadership studies. Those broader qualitative studies could provide evidence that would provide a better understanding behind the social or personal antecedents of emergent leadership behavior.

This study relies heavily on self-reported measures and thus introduces the possibility of inaccuracies through poor or over inflated self-evaluations. Nevertheless, participants are reflecting on their perceived realities and responding to that personal reality and acting accordingly. Regardless of the accuracy of the different types of self-reported evaluations, the individual’s behavior and affective measures are the focus of this study and neither should be impacted greatly by the difference between perceived reality and reality.

Other significant limitations include sample size and type of organization. Though there will be over a hundred participants used in data collection, all data will come from a single organization. This creates some minor issues; many of the individually reported social networks will contain substantial overlap of group members and the single organization sample creates a problem in drawing generalizations. The single organization being used is also geographically contained to a south-central state. It is possible that regions in the United States could view the social appropriateness of emergent leadership differently and this would create concerns in drawing generalizations about emergent leaders.

Finally, this study could contain some researcher bias. I am a pastor of a local church congregation and the organization being studied is a similar to my own community of faith in my own community. Quantitative studies that rely on metrics and
survey measure can limit some bias, but I will be expected to interpret the collected data including both numbers and interviews. It is in the interpretation that I must take great care in letting the data speak for itself and not adding meaning or value to the results of this study.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

Chapter Two provides a review of the literature and current theories regarding followers and followership and how followership is understood in the larger frame of leadership. The literature review will also cover emergent leadership, social network theories, organizational commitment and emotional engagement. Chapter Three explains the three-phase convergent mixed method approach of the study used to conduct the research. Chapter Four covers the results of the quantitative data collection from phase one and two and Chapter Five the results of the qualitative data collection from phase three, addressing how followers give or receive permission for leaders to emerge in their social groups. Chapter Six will discuss the results of the findings; answer the research questions guiding this study, and offer recommendations for future research and practical implications of the findings.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will examine some of the assumptions and difficulties defining followership as well as recent developments in the study of followership, including how we understand the roles of followers in the leadership process. This review will also explore the role of followers in traditional theories and give a broad overview of how followers influence the leadership process. This literature review will look at emergent leadership and how it has been studied in the past. Both organizational commitment and emotional engagement will be reviewed and the role group prototypicality plays in the process of leaders emerging from their peers. Social network theory will also be reviewed to examine how social constructs create a backdrop for the process of leadership.

Leadership and Followership

The focus of this study is on both the follower and followership within the emergent leadership process. Studying followership is relatively new compared to the research and theory development in the broader category of leadership studies. Although the study of followers and what followers do is still in its infancy theoretical developments and challenges exist and should be addressed. Two persistent problems in studying followership are intimately bound up in the interpretation of leadership. The first is the ongoing debate about what is leadership (Burns, 1978; Ciulla, 2003; Rost, 1991). Is it a specific social action? A role? A personality type? Leadership is often studied by scholars only in the context of their profession or discipline of study (i.e., anthropology, social psychology, human relations, theology, etc.). Unfortunately, this
limited method of viewing leadership adds a deeper complexity to the problem of defining leadership because the restricted view of leadership limited by a singular profession or discipline makes leadership overly context dependent. For example, if scholars are from the schools of business they typically focus on business management, and how leadership looks in their specific organizational environment. Solely focusing on manager and business leadership may create an environment of silo thinking in the understanding of leadership. Soli thinking promotes leadership researchers in business environment to be overly focused on the leadership process in one specific discipline or context. Context is certainly important to account for in leadership studies but only focusing on one context limits the understanding of leadership. The way a leader responds in a crisis situation in the military is usually different than how a leader would respond in crisis in a non-profit organization. Studying leadership in only one discipline overly restricts the understanding of leadership and drastically limits our understanding of the role a follower plays in the leadership process.

The second problem focuses on the components required for the leadership process. Leadership does not happen in isolation or a vacuum. Traditionally, scholars have focused on leaders, but in order to lead, someone must be following the leader. Followers are important in the leadership process, but organizational context as a variable is also important – different contextual and environmental conditions affect both leaders and followers. Leaders, context, and followers are all critical to understand the larger leadership process (Kellerman, 2012). Both followers and context require more attention from researchers studying the leadership process.
Leader or follower. Horsfall (2001) stated that the vast majority of people are both followers and leaders in life. No matter the titles people have or salary people make, most people will spend their time answering to someone as a follower instead of giving directions as a leader. So, it makes sense that leadership researchers should spend more time examining the role people most often fulfill on a day-to-day basis. Followers are usually only recognized as a means by which goals are met and leaders can accomplish tasks. However, De Pree (2008) believed that leaders could only really accomplish goals and tasks by voluntary permission of their followers. Followers must choose to follow their leader in order for the leadership process to function. Followers and the process of followership must be a major part of the understanding of leadership or else the understanding of leadership is incomplete.

Even today, the current political climate has favored followers in the realignment of the Middle East. The Arab Spring culminated from a series of demonstrations that brought about a new political reality; the political leaders are not shaping the future of their countries, but emerging leaders from their citizen-followers are changing the political landscape (Marzouki, 2012). A new shift in power from leaders to followers is becoming more common because of social networking, group empowerment, and the information age. The power shift creates a significant change in the relationship of influence between leaders and followers (D. Brooks, 2012). This revolutionary shift in power needs to be recognized and studied, but unfortunately there has been very few studies done to understand followership.

Deficiency in understanding followership. Over the last century researchers have pointed out the deficiencies in our study of leadership and followership. Follett
(1987) advocated for more research into a topic she considered of the utmost importance, followers. She stated the role followers play in leadership has not been studied nearly enough. Regrettably, contemporaries of Follet believed that either you are a leader or nothing of much importance. Other scholars such as Heller and vanTil (1982) noted the discussion of followers and followership by itself is very uncommon. Some scholars recognize this gap in research. But most researchers press forward solely focusing on leaders and their ability to exert power and influence on other people.

Thousands of articles have been written to discuss leaders and leadership but comparatively very few articles are written about followership (Crossman & Crossman, 2011; Kellerman, 2012; Lundin & Lancaster, 1990). Scholars currently find themselves in an exceptional place when it comes to the development of a followership theory. Scholars have the ability to shape, develop, and build a followership theory, and it is even more extraordinary for scholars to be in the developmental stages of understanding how a discipline affects society, but this is exactly where followership scholars find themselves today. Goffee and Jones (2001) observed that the analysis of followership has barely begun. Together scholars of psychology, sociology, leadership studies, and organizational studies have the opportunity to make a lasting contribution so that researchers can better understand the process of followership and of course leadership.

Kelley’s seminal work, *In the praise of followers* (Kelley, 1988) and *The power of followership* (Kelley, 1992), created a framework and an initial means to understand followers as the independent focus of organizational success and even a leader’s success. However, this idea of leaders being dependent upon followers runs against the grain of
most leadership theories, where it is the leader that causes success or failure and good followers just do as they are told.

**Followers**

This study is examining the follower and the nature of the followers following and emerging as a leader among their peers in informal leadership. A follower is an organizational or group member that interacts and reports to or accepts the authority and influence of another group member who is designated as a leader (Chaleff, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1988, 1992). I am particularly focused on the process of followers being influenced and responding to the influence of other followers displaying emergent leadership behavior. Followers, along with leaders and context, have been identified as the three components of leadership that need to be studied to better understand the leadership process (Kellerman, 2012).

**Defining followers and followership.** In trying to understand leadership, many scholars have used the term subordinate to describe and define followers while others are deeply concerned with the image the word subordinate conjures: a person in a low position, powerless and lacking authority. This image is of someone being less important and overly submissive to the people in leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Northouse, 2010). This description of a subordinate and submissive person is often interpreted as a negative image and portrays followers as powerless dehumanized objects. Subordinates are the means by which leaders accomplish tasks (Agho, 2009) but followers must be seen for what they are - active participants, collaborators, and partners with their leaders (Uhl-Bien, 2006).
Leaders inspire and create vision; they can even be well equipped with traits and skills, but they will always be limited by this fact - followers give permission to let leaders lead (De Pree, 2008). A permissive act of trust must occur in followers to allow leaders to lead. The follower is a relational role and this social process in leadership must be taken into account (S. D. Baker, 2007; Heller & van Til, 1982; Kelley, 1992).

If being a follower implies a relationship to a leader, then the difficulty to properly define who is a follower is directly tied to the difficulty to properly define who or what is a leader. Stogdill (1974) pointed out there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it. Considering followers are connected to leadership through a relational role, it is no wonder that a definition for follower is difficult to construct. Ultimately, followership is similar to leadership; it can take on various forms based on what qualities or characteristics researchers emphasize in their study of followers (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Foster, 1989).

The definition of followership must be broad enough to encapsulate all the various aspects and functions of followers, but it must be narrow enough to reduce the field of study and minimalize extraneous influence so that we can specifically identify what is being studied. Followership is a relational role in which group members have the ability to influence leaders and contribute to the improvement and attainment of group and organizational objectives. It is primarily a upward hierarchical influence (Carsten et al., 2010). This definition creates a frame to emphasize the gaps in research where followers are not taken into account for their role in the leadership process. Most leadership theories and practices are dependent one way or another on the cooperation of followers in order for leaders and their organizations to be successful.
Role of followers in traditional theories. Followership has not gone completely unnoticed by researchers, but many theories only recognize followers to a lesser degree than they deserve. Early research in contingency theory identifies followers as a major variable to leader success. For this reason, Zierden (1980) proposed that the contingency model should take followers very seriously and recognize that subordinates are more than a managed resource and could be responsible for the success or failure of the leaders in their organization.

The leader-member exchange model (LMX) researched and developed by Graen, Scandura, and Uhl-Bein (1995) recognized the importance of social interaction between leaders and followers or group members (Zhou & Schriesheim, 2010). LMX focuses on the social process developed over time within the dyadic relationship of leader and follower. However, LMX still places the responsibility of success on the leader’s skills in developing relationships, which makes leaders the primary agent of the organization’s success.

Hersey and Blanchard’s situational leadership theory argues that successful leadership is often dependent upon using specific leadership styles based on the follower’s readiness (Daft & Lane, 2008; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Situational leadership theory focuses on the characteristics of the followers to determine the leader’s behavior. This theory takes researchers a step closer in recognizing the importance of followers in the leadership process and makes followers a primary contextual variable for leaders to assess when determining their actions as leaders. Overall, this is a stronger position for followers in a leadership model, but the leader is still the primary agent that determines organizational success.
Burns (1978) promoted two leadership models people use to achieve success. One is transactional leadership where leaders establish an exchange process with followers based on followers’ needs or desires. The other is transformational leadership where leader and follower change and grow together to create a better organization.

Transactional leadership uses the desires of followers in way to motivate them to achieve specific objectives or performance. This model is at best a balancing act between the giver and taker in the relationship, usually leaders and followers, but it often creates an environment of competition of resources between them.

Burns also describes a second model called transformational leadership. Instead of the adversarial role of transactional leadership, transformational leadership is cooperative - leaders and followers grow and change together. Leaders enact vision, implement strategy, and create culture or climate that promotes a network of positive relationships. Followers contribute to innovation and take on a more personal responsibility for the organization. Transformational leadership encourages both leaders and followers to be a part of something greater than themselves and accomplish great things that make a difference for all involved in the organization.

Burns’ observations of both transformational and transactional leadership models recognize the follower in the leadership process. Transactional leadership can be adversarial; leaders could victimize followers through manipulation and take advantage of them through their personal needs. Transformational leadership is model for studying followers and many researchers have used the transformational frame to show the positive dyadic relationships as well as the positive outcomes of leaders and followers working together for the greater good. Unfortunately, researchers have used the
transformational frame to primarily study leaders and their ability, actions, and behaviors again reducing followers as another variable in the system.

Howell and Shamir (2005) look at charismatic leadership where leaders use followers’ self-concepts to influence and lead people. Inspiration and motivation based on needs and desires of followers are the leader’s tools to accomplish goals and objectives. Charismatic leaders appeal to the heart and mind pursuing goals with fervor and passion (Ciulla, 2003; Weber, Henderson, & Parsons, 1964). This theory recognizes the role of the follower and the permission of those followers for the leader to lead. The follower’s role in charismatic leadership is permissive compliance.

**Follower typology.** In order to study followers and followership, researchers have tried to determine what makes a good or bad follower by examining their traits, behaviors, and skills. Initially researchers in leadership have looked at leader’s traits, behaviors, and skills to categorize leaders and generalize the evidence to determine what traits leader possesses cause organizational success or failure. Consequently early followership researchers would look at the follower and collect empirical evidence to compare how a follower’s traits, behaviors, and skills impact the leadership process (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Gilbert & Hyde, 1988; Kelley, 1988). Several researchers have created different typologies of followers with some limited success (Chaleff, 2009; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1992). These researchers began the recent shift of followers becoming primary topic of research and recognized for the role they play in leadership.

Kelley’s (1992) seminal work on followership categorized followers according to dimensions of thinking and acting. Evaluations of followers are made to determine if they
are critical thinkers or dependent upon leaders to determine proper action. Personal drive is also evaluated to see if followers are self-motivated or dependent on leaders to motivate them. Kelley’s typology is the first attempt to help scholars categorize types of followers and determine how each group promotes or hinders the success of an organization by critical thinking ability and personal motivation that leads to engagement and commitment.

Chaleff (2009) created a typology based on a follower’s willingness to support and challenge their leaders. Chaleff believes followers are partners and should see themselves as equal to leaders in responsibility, but are aware and respectful of the leader’s position and authority. His categorization of followers demonstrated that follower’s actions, abilities and engagement in goal attainment and can be connected to both the success of the leader and organization. Chaleff continues his work in followership by examining the values and skills necessary for followers to take responsibility for supporting or disobeying a leader when a leader asks a follower to act immorally. Leaders and followers are expected to develop a situational awareness, discernment, and personal accountability when participating in the leadership process (Chaleff, 2015). Both Kelley and Chaleff do not rule out the importance of the leader but both point to followers as the primary means of organizational success and protection.

Kellerman (2008) created a typology for followers using emotional and cognitive engagement as a means of classification. She has taken into account not just what followers know they ought to do, but also the willingness to act on the knowledge they have. Kellerman viewed leadership from a bottom-up perspective and demonstrate how followers can influence leaders by using less power and authority compared to leaders
but still cause personal and organizational change. She recognizes that followers have their own motives and their own stake in organizational change independent of the leader’s desires. They can work with or against leadership even in revolutionary fashion.

Each of these typologies creates a framework to study followers on their own terms and independently from leaders. Certainly, leaders are important in the leadership process but followers drive success or failure based on their desires and their relationship to the leaders and their organization.

**Role of followers.** Scholars have also attempted to look at the role that followers play in the leadership process. Kelley (1988) believed that to understand what it means to be an effective follower researchers must understand the role they play in the leadership process and it is more than submission and obedience to the leader. This follower role calls for interaction with leaders but also acknowledges the interactions followers have among themselves. Rost (1991) stated that leadership is fundamentally a relational process, so part of the responsibility of both leader and follower is to communicate effectively and be willing to compensate for each other's weaknesses. Hollander (1974) saw the role of followers connected directly to a set of behaviors that are determined by the position of duties and tasks in the organization.

Researchers and scholars in the late 20th century have called for more studies to be focused on the active nature of followers and the role they play in the leadership process (Avolio et al., 2009; Carsten et al., 2010; Chaleff, 2009; Hollander, 1974, 1992; Kelley, 1992; Shamir, 2007). This study focuses on followers’ social interactions that allow informal emergent leadership to develop among the followers in an organization and lead as context dictates.
Leadership Emergence

Research in leadership emergence examines how groups without formal leadership structure allow individuals to assume informal leadership roles so that group members as a collective create organizational structure to share expertise and achieve shared goals of the collective (Ho et al., 2012; Mann, 1959). Emergent leaders are group members that initially hold equal status with peers but exhibit high levels of leadership behavior and thus achieve higher status in the collective conceptualization of the social order (Berdahl, 1996). It is important to recognize that while some groups make emergent leadership into a pseudo formal leadership structure, this is a dynamic social process which involves much less hierarchical patterns of status but allows change and flexibility in leadership (Berdahl, 1996). Leadership emergence is recognized by both the group as a collective, the individual member perceptions of other group members (Berson et al., 2006; Gershenoff & Foti, 2003; Lord et al., 1984) and has also been shown to identified by people external to the group (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Guastello, 2007). This ability to identify emerging leaders through close relationships by other group members creates a means to both identify and examine traits and the behaviors group members display as group members emerge from the organization’s social network as leaders.

Leadership among peers. In autonomous groups, such as churches, organizational members not in formal leadership roles are expected to share the responsibility for the success of community (Taggar et al., 1999). Often there is no designated leader outside formal leadership structure, but leadership is still practiced as a dynamic social group process where a follower can emerge from among all other followers when his or her individual expertise is recognized by the group as a ways to
help the organization achieve a goal or overcome an immediate challenge. This social process demonstrates the development of a clear informal leadership development that arises within the social structure of the group (Neubert & Taggar, 2004; Taggar et al., 1999). There have been several studies to indicate precursors to leader emergence. Active involvement in the organization and displays of high motivation in a group context creates the perception of leadership, which then allows certain group members to assume leadership roles in the group (Sorrentino & Field, 1986). Organizational environment, personal dynamics, motivation, organizational engagement, commitment, and tasks at hand create a fertile context for people to emerge from the group to participate in leadership (S. Oh, 2012).

**Function of emergent leaders.** Morgeson, DeRue, and Karam (2010) demonstrated leaders perform specific social functions in a group or organizational context. The role of the leader is to satisfy the group needs and solve problems in the way of the collective goals. According to Morgeson et al. (2010) emerging leaders can also have specific functions in the group such as defining group mission, creating informal structure, providing honest feedback to formal leaders, solving group problems, enabling team task completion, and supporting the social climate all of which can be a precursor or be used to predict emergent leadership through the coordinated communication role of leaders (Hawkins, 1995). This is similar to the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale being used in this study.

Other researchers recognize there is a structural aspect to emergent leaders and they utilize both communication and social structure to identify emerging leaders in a group. Mullen, Salas, and Driskell (1989) identified a consistent pattern for individual
group members with the highest level of verbal participation to emerge more frequently as leaders in the group. Members demonstrating higher volume of communication and group participation through distributing information were perceived more readily as leaders. Stein and Heller (1983) found when members possessed superior task abilities and expertise they made more contributions to the group through increased participation and collaborating, thus assisting the dissipation of task necessity information through communication and idea sharing which in turn increased leadership status within the group's social structure. This strongly indicates that social network measures such as degree or centrality could play a large role in identifying potential emergent leaders.

**Roles of emergent leaders.** More recently, Yoo and Alavi (2004) identified three primary roles emergent leaders play in the social dynamics of the group. Emergent leaders tend to be initiators; they are typically the first to act. They are schedulers; they coordinate work and problem solving efforts of group to create or preserve efficiency. Finally, they are integrators, making themselves responsible to combine the work and effort of the group for final product. According to Tyran, Tyran, and Shepherd (2003) emergent leaders are strongly perceived as trustworthy by the group. Wolff, Pescosolido, and Druskat (2002) and Pescosolido (2002) found emergent leaders had higher emotional intelligence and empathy. Kent and Moss (1990) showed that high self-monitoring group members evaluate group situations better and, therefore, prepare themselves to emerge as leaders. Wickham and Walther (2007) studied virtual groups but found that emergent leaders were perceived to have higher ability to communicate emotional intelligence. All of these studies support the fundamental social group dynamic of trust and the importance of the perceptions of group members in leader emergence. The group’s
perceptions are the foundation of consent that collectively gives a group member permission to emerge as a leader when context dictates.

The research conducted in the last several decades show emergent leadership occurs in the social construct of the group members in an organization. Individual followers through peer recognition of behavior such as initiative, proactivity, and self-monitoring, and traits such as trustworthy, empathy, and communicate emotion separated followers from his or her peers to be identified as leaders from among the other followers.

**Social Identity Theory of Leadership and Prototypicality**

Hogg (2001) developed the social identity theory of leadership by combining two theories, social identity theory (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971) and self-categorization theory (Tajfel, 1969) to establish a framework to better understand the psychological basis of intergroup discrimination (Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel et al., 1971), or why group members favor particular members of their group as leaders while at the same time easily finding fault in other members (Haslam, 2001). Social categorization is a cognitive group behavior which breaks people into ingroup and outgroup categories while at the same time accentuating the perceived similarities of the ingroup and maximizing the differences of the outgroup (Hogg & Terry, 2012). Social categorization of the self, or self-categorizing, assimilates the self into the ingroup stressing the similarities of values, abilities, goals, and characteristics of the group. These two social psychological processes have a significant effect on how individuals participate, cooperate and emerge as leaders in the leadership process.
The main tenet of the social identity theory of leadership states that as group membership becomes psychologically salient to the individual group member both leader effectiveness and leader endorsement are directly connected to how the leader represents the expected characteristics of the group, also referred to as group prototypicality (Hogg, Abrams, Otten, & Hinkle, 2004). Giessner, van Knippenberg, van Ginkel, and Sleebos (2013) defines group prototypicality as “the degree of similarity a person has to the group prototype, it is a mental representation of the characteristics that define a group in comparison to relevant other groups” (p. 659). Prototypicality facilitates shared group norms, stereotypes, positive intergroup attitudes and cohesion, cooperation, collective behavior, shared ideals, and mutual influence (Hogg & Terry, 2012). For leaders prototypicality is the degree to which the leader is seen as an exemplar of the collective behavior and shared ideals of the group he or she is a member.

Prototypicality. It is important to understand that prototypicality often changes over time depending on the collective's understanding of what ideas, values, and goals are important to the group, thus reducing, eliminating, creating or sustaining shared leadership schemas. How a group member evaluates the group leader’s prototypicality determines how the group member evaluates the leader as effective or ineffective (Haslam, 2001; Hogg, 2001). Highly prototypical leaders are often expected to act in a manner to protect the group's identity so that they also protect their own position of influence within the group (Hogg et al., 2004). Leadership is intimately bound up with the shared concerns and identity of the collective (Haslam, 2001).

Followers tend to be drawn to more prototypical leaders because they are more reflective of the group’s shared values and norms. Interestingly, prototypical leaders are
perceived and often behave in a group serving manner, thus creating trust to enable them to be seen as the best source of information for the group. Reicher, Haslam, and Hopkins (2005) concluded that leadership is contingent on leaders being perceived as a group's prototypical member to be influential and effective. Berscheid and Reis (1998) found these conclusions compatible with their research while demonstrating people are more likely to agree with others who are similar to themselves and comply with requests and suggestions. So it reasons that as long as the leader is reflective of the group norms and ideals, they will have a stronger position to influence and guide individuals and the group.

**Prototypicality and leadership endorsement.** Platow and van Knippenberg (2001) found prototypical members were endorsed more often as leaders in the group tasks that were categorized as ambiguous. When nonprototypical leaders attempted to lead their group in ambiguous tasks, their leadership ratings were significantly lower. So, as group members increase their identity within the group, they were more likely and more readily able to release their implicit leadership schemas about what leaders should do, how they should behave, and the characteristics they should have to lead.

Platow and van Knippenberg (2001) analyzed how group members rate prototypical leaders in issues of fairness. Ingroup favoring leaders receive much stronger endorsements of fairness when group members strongly identified with the group. These findings imply ingroup leaders have more freedom and flexibility to act in group normative behavior as well as nonnormative ways than other group members or members of peripheral groups (Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001). This gives clues to determine how outgroup leaders can gain group endorsement through practicing ingroup favoritism,
giving social allegiance, and giving special preference to the ingroup members they are trying to influence. Ullrich, Christ, and van Dick (2009) indicated leadership prototypicality influences the relationship between perceived fairness and leader endorsement. This shows the opportunity followers and new organizational members have to influence other group members to gain trust and group endorsement for leadership by aligning with and developing strong social connections with ingroup members particularly with those ingroup members that are more prototypical of the organization.

**Prototypicality and influence.** Platow and van Knippenberg (2001) argued that prototypical leaders possess more flexibility and latitude in their behavior compared to other group members because of the strong sense of ingroup membership. This study reveals that followers give prototypical leaders permission to make decisions with little impact on followers’ perceived effectiveness of the leader in making decisions for the group. However, less prototypical leaders do not have that luxury and ingroup members would be less tolerant of behavior that does not reflect the group's values or norms.

Two more studies built upon these findings and predicted prototypical leaders using different types of influence tactics would not lose leadership endorsement ratings when followers have strong identification within their group (B. van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005; D. van Knippenberg, 2011). They also showed that prototypical leaders were rated as less effective leaders if they use strong arm influential tactics rather than appealing to a softer relational approach. They found non-prototypical leaders’ relationships with followers deteriorated when they exercised strong influential tactics and saw better results when they used the softer relational appeal. High identifying group
members that were influenced by non-prototypical leaders believed their relationship with the leaders worsen when leaders used soft tactics. However, leader-follower relations were enhanced when leaders were recognized as prototypical, regardless of influential tactics (Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; B. van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005).

**Organizational Commitment**

Research has indicated organizational commitment is related to a wide variety of behaviors and actions of group members. Recently, the idea of organizational commitment has been used to describe a multifaceted group of ideas which include different terms and concepts like organizational identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), cohesion (Mudrack, 1989), and collectivism (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). All are similar social processes that have an effect on theoretical traditions of organizational behavior, but each is different in its own right.

**Organizational commitment and identification.** Two concepts greatly affected by social identity theory are organizational identification and organizational commitment. Organization identification is “a specific form of social identification associated with definition of the self in terms of the organization as a whole” (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 22). Organizational commitment is “a commitment to the goals and values of the organization as a whole and willingness to exert effort on its behalf” (Haslam, 2001, p. 109). Both constructs occupy an important place in organizational behavior literature, but the nuanced difference is found in the individual’s construct of the self (Mowday et al., 1979; Salancik, 1977).
Organization identification is the extent a group member defines the self in terms of membership in the organization and it is reflected as a perceived oneness with the organization (D. van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). So, organization identification reflects the psychological merging of the self and organization (Haslam, 2001; D. van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). The more people identify with an organization's values, norms, and interests, the more those values, norms, and interests are incorporated into the individual’s concept of the self. The values, norms, and interests associated with organizational identification are the basis of the group process of prototypicality mentioned previously (Hogg & Terry, 2012).

Organizational commitment is an attitudinal construct of a group member. Mowday et al. (1982) characterized the origin of personal organizational commitment on three fundamental beliefs of the individual. First, people are committed when they believe in and approve of the organization’s goals and principles. Second, organization members are then motivated to exert considerable effort for the benefit of the organization. And finally, group members desire to continue membership in the organization. So, organization commitment refers to a group member’s feelings about the organization or the psychological bond an individual has with his or her organization (Mowday et al., 1982) and is this self-reported construct used in this study.

Meyer and Allen (1997) suggested the organizational commitment of an individual results in the group members who are willing to stay with their organization through thick and thin. They attend meetings regularly, dedicate personal work time for the organization, protect the organization's assets, and share in the organizational goals. Meyer and Allen (1997) also believed group members with strong commitments to the
organization are considered more valuable group members than those who are less committed. This also fits with Meyer et al. (1993) definition which includes the likelihood group members will stay or leave the organization based on their commitment level and also reaffirms the importance of particular traits and behaviors of prototypical leaders in social identity theory of leaders (Hogg, 2001). This type of commitment to the organization could be a prototypical trait for members of the organization. Those members displaying organizational commitment would then be more likely to emerge as leaders and be viewed as more effective leaders within the group (Hogg, 2001).

**Allen and Meyer organizational commitment model.** Allen and Meyer (1990) constructed a three-component model of an individual’s commitment to the organization based on different antecedents in which each component of commitment is distinguished from the other two. The three components of attitudinal commitment are identified as affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. It is important to recognize each component develops independently and describes a different aspect of psychological state (Allen & Meyer, 1990). So, individuals can experience each of the psychological components simultaneously and also at different degrees. The attitudinal score is the net sum of the three components combined together but each component can be used to measure an aspect of the psychological state of the individual as they relate to their organization.

Meyer and Allen (1997) recognized two broad categories of variables, distal and proximal, in the Meyer and Allen Model of Organizational Commitment. The distant variables are beyond the organization's environment and thus outside the control of the organization. Proximal variables are within the organization's environment and so
organizations have some influence and control of these variables. A group member's commitment is related to his or her perspective of these variables and how the distal and proximal variables influence the individual commitment to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The three components of attitudinal commitment are identified as affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

**Affective commitment.** Affective commitment is based on an individual's desire to continue organizational membership (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and is tied to group members’ emotional attachment to the organization, identification with the organization, and their involvement within the organization. This implies the measured value is derived from feelings or beliefs in what the organization stands for and is related to psychological and organizational factors (Withey & Cooper, 1989). The bottom line is individuals with strong affective commitment are with the organization because they want to be with the organization.

The primary antecedents to affective commitment are organizational characteristics and the organizational experiences, which accumulate over time as an individual participates in the organization. Organizational characteristics include, but are not limited to, decentralized social structure, fairness of organizational policy, and communication of policy. An individual's experience in the organization leading to attitudinal commitment are autonomy, decision-making participation, leader consideration, support of superiors, and fairness (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Many of these antecedents are focused on individual experiences and can only be measured by the perceptions of individuals. As individuals fulfill specific social roles in a group, they also
evaluate their social fit, satisfaction of needs, rationalization, and determine if the organization has met their expectations, all of which determine if members value belonging to the organization.

**Continuance commitment.** The second commitment component, continuance commitment, is based on an individual’s need for organizational membership (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This is an economic based decision affected by the individual’s understanding of the cost to stay or leave the organization. Group members with strong continuance commitment stay with an organization based on the personal social losses and consequences of leaving the organization. Often individuals consider perceived alternatives or the lack of alternatives which can include time, effort, or other resources gained or lost if the person leaves the organization (Wallace, 1997).

The primary antecedent to continuance commitment is environmental conditions, which can impact the health of the group member, health being a measure of physical health, financial health, emotional health, social health, etc. This can also be affected by social responsibility and status. Again, the perceptions influencing continual commitment are centered on the alternatives and investments as envisioned by the individual.

**Normative commitment.** Normative commitment is established through the individuals’ beliefs that they have an obligation or sense of duty to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This is often influenced by group members’ experiences before and after they join or commit to the organization, specifically cultural upbringing and cultural understanding of organizational authority (Meyer & Allen, 1991). People with strong normative commitments are members of an organization because they feel they ought to be. Social experiences including family and culture are primary
antecedents to normative commitment. These indicate an individual's experience and socialization could predispose them to either commitment, restricted commitment, or no commitment obligation to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Normative commitment can also be affected by status and the assumed psychological contract between organizations and organizational members (Meyer & Allen, 1997). According to Robinson, Kraatz, and Rousseau (1994) psychological contracts describe an individual’s belief about their organizational relationship and guide group member’s belief about what they think that they are entitled to receive because of real or perceived promises from their organizations. The assumed contracts are connected to an individual’s role in the organization and how they handle conflict and work overload. Issues within organizations, like member expectations, obligations, reciprocity and the feeling of indebtedness, can affect the normative commitment component.

Organizational commitment and member behavior. Over recent years, research has established affective organizational commitment correlates to a variety of behavioral indicators like turnover, attendance, tardiness, and absenteeism (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Also salary, age, sex, organizational tenure, education attainment, and job performance all tie in with commitment and related to employee turnover (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986).

Angle and Perry (1981) looked at organizational commitment of “low-level” employees in their organizations to see how it relates to organizational effectiveness. They determined affective commitment was associated to organizational adaptability of lower-level employees but not managers. This could be a result of how different levels or strata of employees interpret exactly what organizational commitment means. They
concluded researchers must account for organizations as complex systems (Lichtenstein et al., 2006). It is difficult to separate out the different variables in order to measure the connection between positive performance and organizational commitment.

Michaels and Spector (1982) looked at the various strata of organizational leaders and workers and found that age, perceived task characteristics, and recognition by leaders led to satisfaction and commitment. Tenure, salary, and organizational level did not show the effect the researchers expected. Interestingly this conflicted with earlier studies where tenure and salary had been connected to turnover and job satisfaction (Porter & Lawler, 1965).

Blau and Boal (1987) evaluated the interaction of organizational involvement and its connection to organizational commitment. Involvement related strongly to the turnover and commitment more than other factors such as sex, marital status, and tenure. Other researchers have extended the study to incorporate absenteeism with similar results (Mathieu & Kohler, 1990).

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) performed a meta-analysis looking at personal characteristics, job characteristics, leader-follower relationships, organizational characteristics, motivation, and job satisfaction and their effects on organizational commitment. The researchers concluded organizational commitment affects job performance measures and organizational member turnover, member’s intention to leave, and organizational output measures. Commitment was also tied to retention and individual performance (Bartlett, 2001). The research indicated as employees or organizational members report higher levels of commitment, they show higher levels of
satisfaction, low work stress, and lower levels of work home life conflict (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Morrow (1993) looked at how organizational commitment correlates with work situations. The correlates of Morrow’s study are the antecedents of organizational commitment. Although Morrow does not reveal any new variables, Morrow does reinforce the strength of the instrument measuring organizational commitment. The general finding is a strong positive relationship between commitment of employee or organizational members desire to stay, weaker commitment leaders to turnover and attendance issues, given these variables are often moderated by a larger, complex set of variables (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Organizational commitment and organizational performance. Mowday et al. (1982) called for more studies to understand the complicated relationship between organizational commitment and job or organization performance. Benkhoff (1997) discovered a strong connection between objective performance measures, like sales targets, sub-sale targets, and change in profits and organizational commitment. Studies like these show employees with strong affective commitment to their workplace work harder at their jobs and perform better at job related tasks then do those with weaker commitment levels (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Others have looked at the relationship between commitment and work behavior more closely. Ellemers, de Gilder, and van den Heuvel (1998) looked at distinguishing between different motives for exerting oneself to give the organization a good employee performance. They divided the participants into groups based on how the participants prioritize goals specifically if employees preferred individual goals or team-oriented
goals. Team oriented members were willing to sacrifice leisure time to help colleagues while individual goal oriented people focused more on career commitments leading to advancements. The findings support the idea that people may feel committed to their work or organization for different reasons, and there may be different types of commitment related to certain types of behaviors in organization (Ellemers, 2012).

Ellemers et al. (1998) showed the attitude a person has about commitment to his or her work team is an important precursor of a group member’s willingness to extend himself or herself on behalf of the common good or team goal and thus live up to what is expected in the larger organization.

**Summary.** Empirical evidence supports people's sense of affective commitment with a group or organization could be the crucial factor which mediates whether or not they will behave in terms of the collective expectation of the group members (Ellemers, 2012). This supports the general notion that when individuals feel committed to the organization, they are more willing to exert themselves in order to achieve shared goals even if they are expected to emerge as leaders for the greater good of the group.

**Organizational Engagement**

Organizational member or employee engagement has drawn the attention of organizational scholars in recent years because of the wide array of effects engagement has on group dynamics, structural effectiveness, innovation, and organization competitiveness (Welch, 2011). There has been a surge of practitioner work from consultant groups which has linked high engagement to high business performance (Harter & Schmidt, 2008; Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002), but the idea of employee engagement has its origins in academic work and has gained considerable popularity in
the last 20 years even though scholars have wrestled with defining precisely what employment engagement means (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). The concept is similar to organizational commitment where the group members develop an affective construct. Determining how group members participate in engagement has been interpreted differently among researchers, practitioners, and business leaders; however, all of them look at members’ connections to roles and tasks within the organization (Ferrer, 2005).

Kahn (1990) is often considered the academic forefather of the employee engagement movement, and his work has made up the central tenets of organizational member engagement. He defined employee engagement as “the harnessing of organizational member’s selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employed and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). Kahn (1992) believed there are three psychological engagement conditions necessary for group members to commit themselves to their group and fully engage to perform group tasks as expected. Often group members are looking for meaningfulness (ties to personal identity through work), social safety (this includes social connections, specific leadership style, and organizational norms) and availability of resources to complete tasks or roles, each of these assist the group member in fully engaging in their organization’s activities (Welch, 2011).

**Antecedents of employee engagement.** Building on Kahn's work, some researchers have focused only on the cognitive and emotional antecedents of employee engagement (Harter & Schmidt, 2008; Harter et al., 2002). This minor change omits Kahn’s behavioral element, the physical engagement component. The other nuanced restriction Harter and Schmidt bring to their understanding of employee engagement is
reducing the primary focus to work and employee relationships thus restricting the engagement construct to work-employee relationships instead of a broader organization and member relationship. This framework for understanding engagement works well when examining businesses or corporations, but unfortunately leaves out possibilities of studying engagement in volunteer or social organizations. In restricting the view to employee relationships, Harter and Schmidt overly narrow the focus of organizational engagement. This work is broadened in Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) definition of organizational engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by bigger, dedication, and absorption” (p. 295). This slight change in definition introduces a two-way nature of employee engagement and emphasizes organizations can develop and nurture engagement in their own workgroups and broadens organizational engagement back to incorporating volunteer or social organizations (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008).

Employee engagement and burnout. More recently, scholars have considered the concept of employee engagement as the antithesis of job or employee burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Saks (2006) combined the best of the previous definitions demonstrating that engagement encompasses both job engagement and organizational engagement. Much like Kahn’s view of engagement, Saks view consisted of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components but, Saks recognized that both the member and organizational group environment affect engagement. The addition of the organizational component refers to the attitude and attachment towards the organization and draws heavily on the idea organizational engagement is not an attitude but a psychological state (Saks, 2006). Unfortunately, researchers have criticized the engagement literature over
concerns that employee and organizational engagement might not be a distinct construct but just a new label attached to other constructs like organizational commitment (Welch, 2011).

**Employee engagement and organizational commitment.** Organizational commitment is characterized as a state rather than an attitude. It is the employee's relationship with the organization and has implications for a member's decision to continue or discontinue membership with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This construct is a psychological link between group members and their organization, which makes it less likely they will leave the organization. So organization commitment is about the relationship to the organization while “engagement is experienced as enthusiasm and self-involvement with a task or collective (for example organization), is fostered by a corresponding dispositional orientation and facilitating climate, and manifest itself in proactive value directed behavior” (Meyer et al., 2010, p. 64). Some scholars have argued engagement is different from commitment and is also an antecedent or variable component to organizational commitment (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Sparrow & Balain, 2010). Most researchers recognize the two constructs are unique but positively related psychological states and are defined and measured differently as distinctive constructs (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014; Saks, 2006).

**Employee engagement and leadership behavior.** Several studies have used employee engagement to evaluate and look at employees or group members and their effect on their organization. Lockwood (2007) revealed organizational members who are highly involved in conceiving, designing, and implementing direction for the organization are more engaged. Konrad (2009) looked at 132 manufacturing firms and
discovered organizations that employ high-performance work systems built on engaged employees had much higher productivity than their competitors. Vosburgh (2008) studied organizational environment to see at how environment affects employees’ energy levels, which manifest and sustain engagement within a supportive work environment. Macey and Schneider (2008) argued certain people are predisposed to engagement and hiring those types of people and placing them in a supportive environment is critical to enabling employees to be continually engaged.

Other researchers have looked beyond the employee or group member to group leaders and have evaluated group leaders’ impact on engagement. Arakawa and Greenberg (2007) evaluated managers and leaders on their optimism and the affect they have on employee engagement. They determined positive emotion from formal leaders influenced positive work performance. Harter et al. (2002) looked at workplace emotional environment and established the supervisor or manager has influence over engagement levels of employees and their satisfaction with the larger organization. Hirchfeld and Hjermsad (2007) concluded to become a more engaging organization leaders must strengthen their leadership structure through evaluation of mid-level and upper level managers. Strengthening competency, providing opportunities for continual learning, and rewarding managers for being highly engaged promotes employees to be more engaged and creates an environment within the organization to be a much larger engaged organization (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Little & Little, 2006). Formal leaders have a significant impact as the models of engagement and assist the development of member engagement throughout their organization.
Employee engagement and organizational culture. The organizational workplace is a major part of any organizational member’s life; it is a place to connect, work, and learn to help an organization to reach its goals. Researchers also claim positive organizational culture, managers, and leaders are antecedents to employee engagement. “Research shows that organizations that provide a workplace culture with psychological conditions of meaningfulness including job enrichment and work role fit, safety which include supportive oversight and coworkers, and availability resource availability are more likely to have engaged employees” Lockwood (2007, p. 5). Olesen, White, and Lemmer (2007) showed how employee motivation and engagement are affected by career opportunities. When group members identify related roles across organizational subunits and geographies groups, leaders create collaboration and assist in the navigation of career opportunities for employees, this in turn affects behavior and employees are more willing to engage in helping the organization with the larger business strategy. Ketter (2008) looked at the challenges organizations have in supporting a culture that supports engagement. His research suggested although organizational culture does impact engagement of employees, developing that kind of culture takes a large collaborative effort by all levels of the organization including leaders, managers, and employees.

Employee engagement and disengagement. Coffman (2003) studied burnout and organizational engagement to attempt to place both phenomena on a singular continuum. He found when employees start a new job their engagement is usually at its peak and unless proactively acted upon slowly declines over time. Crabtree (2004) showed engaged employees work with passion when assigned tasks and they felt very connected to their organization. This connectedness inspires others to be innovative and
moves the whole organizational forward. Crabtree went on to develop three categories for member engagement. There are fully engaged members who work with passion on the tasks assigned to them, not engaged members who are emotionally distant or disconnected from the tasks assigned to them, and finally, actively disengaged members who deliberately attempt to sabotage the organization's well being.

Coffman (2000) was also able to connect profit, sales, and customer satisfaction to employee engagement. He extended these findings to determine workplace safety and retention rate of organizational members was strongly affected by employee engagement. Coffman, Kompaso, and Sridevi (2010) found similar results supporting these relationships and established the connection of member engagement to organizational performance measures such as productivity, profitability, loyalty, and safety.

Finally, Attridge (2009) demonstrated organizations can respond to member disengagement at both the individual member level and at the larger organization level. He showed how larger organizational level leaders need to address job or task design, organizational environment conditions, availability of resources for job completion, and using effective leadership styles to influence group members.

**Summary.** Organizational engagement is closely associated with organization commitment where organizational commitment is about the follower’s relationship to the organization and a follower’s engagement is the enthusiasm and self-involvement with the tasks necessary for the organization’s well being. A follower’s engagement is strengthen when he or she feels connected to their organization but a follower that is not engaged may feel emotionally distant or disconnected from the tasks assigned. A follower’s level of engagement is related to willingness to sacrifice for the organization.
This supports the idea that when individuals feel engaged with the tasks assigned to them in the organization, they are more willing to exert and sacrifice to achieve shared goals and possibly emerge as leaders for the greater good of the group.

**Social Network Theory**

A social network is a set of nodes that represent a collection of socially relevant objects such as individuals, groups, organizations, subgroups etc. and the relationships, which bind or tie the objects together. Social network theory focuses on the relationships and the attributes of the set of nodes and particularly examines the patterns of relationships within the network and the effects of the patterns on the network. A general social network theory is the idea that a node’s position in a network determines in part the constraints and opportunities the node has in the network, and so identifying that position is important for predicting outcomes such as performance, behavior, or beliefs (Borgatti et al., 2013). This is important because social networks make up the underlying social structure of all groups and organizations and those networks are the means by which leadership operates in communicating, influencing, and allocating resources (Goldstein et al., 2010).

Social network analyses are built on a set of assumptions; the largest assumption is that the environments, attributes, or circumstances do not affect nodes or actors independently. This seems very intuitive from the definition of a social network focused on relationships, but it has significant ramifications in testing hypotheses because standard inferential tests assume observations are statistically independent; in network analyses they are not statistically independent (Borgatti et al., 2013). A second assumption in social network theory is ties and relationships do not exist as uniform,
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cohesive, and discretely bound groups. Some relationships or ties are distinctly different based on type and magnitude (Marin & Wellman, 2011). Also, network analyses take the context of the network seriously; so studied relationships are often analyzed in the context of other relationships. It is common to see research of networks within larger networks where the sub-network is viewed in the context of the larger network as it acts as a backdrop to the network being studied (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). A portion of this study will be looking at ego networks that represent social psychological influences in the context of an organization’s larger social network. Ego networks are a part of a larger network that examines a particular node or person, which is called the ego. The ego network is the network of all the nodes the ego is connected and the relationships between those nodes (B. Brooks, Hogan, Ellison, Lampe, & Vitak, 2014).

Social structure and relationship patterns. In networks, individuals possess particular attributes such as gender, race, or education level, which inherently are contained within the person. People are often sorted into groups based on attributes and researchers connect experimental outcome to the internal attributes to make causation something that comes from an individual. Social network analysis techniques allow researchers to examine causation as a result of social structure and not from within the individual or a result of a set of attributes. Granted while people with similar attributes may behave in similar manners, this does not take into account the idea that people with similarities often have similar social network positions (Marin & Wellman, 2011).

Through studying behavior such as emergent leadership embedded in a social network, researchers are able to study the macro-level patterns and not simply a large number of participants acting the same way or filling out surveys in a similar manner.
Social network analysis allows social scientists to look at a large number of people acting on one another to shape one another's attitudes and actions that lead to a particular outcome. It is misguided to draw conclusions on the basis of individual attributes, characteristics, values, or the features alone (Wellman, 1988). Instead, the social network should be taken into account and researchers should examine the social structure where people are embedded so they can determine the influence to any actor or node in the network (Coleman, 1988; Wasserman & Faust, 1994; Wellman, 1988).

**Social influence.** Social network analysis creates a new dimension in studying leadership from a social psychological perspective because researchers are given the relational information to map the potential social psychological forces which restrict or encourage leadership behavior (Mayo, Meindl, & Pastor, 2003; Seibert, Sparrowe, & Liden, 2003). The social network approach to leadership allows for measurement of two dimensions of leadership within the organization, the number of connections (or degree) reflects a person's potential scope of leadership based on the number of followers that look to them, and the magnitude of influence potential based on position in the network, or how key people can see the effectiveness of the potential leader. Social network approach provides a framework to look at informal or emergent leadership behavior models by distinguishing the multiple individual influences each person has on another in the network. These influential relationships create patterns of influence between followers and organizational members.

This type of analysis provides information about how each person connects to one another and also how a person is connected within the organizational network as a whole (Hanneman & Riddle, 2005). An analysis of the influence of leaders in an organization
reveals a network of influence relationships where some group members will have more influence than others, and some subgroups of people will have more integration of social relationships or well-connected influential ties than others. A social network perspective allows for multiple levels of analysis to occur simultaneously (Hanneman & Riddle, 2005).

Centrality measures. Social network researchers use several types of analyses to understand an actor’s location and influence within a network. Centrality measures are a group of measures that represent a person’s prominence, opportunities, or status in their network. Degree centrality is the number of ties or relationships an individual has with other members in the network; an individual with more ties is considered more central in the social network. Degree centrality is representative of the distribution of leadership influence in a network, the more relationships a leader has the more people they can potentially inspire in their organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). Degree centrality $d_i$ of actor $i$ is simply the summation of all adjacent nodes or people in the social network. $x_{ij}$ is the value of the relationship composite, or presence of a tie from the $i$th person (row in the matrix) in the matrix to the $j$th person (column in the matrix). $d_i = \sum_j x_{ij}$ represents the equation for degree centrality. Degree centrality can be further broken down into indegree, those people that look to a leader to lead, and outdegree, which could represent the people a leader goes to influence and make changes in the organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006).

Eigenvector centrality is a variation of degree centrality in which you count the number of nodes adjacent to a given node like degree centrality except you also weight each adjacent node by its centrality, where $e_i$ is the eigenvector centrality score for the $i$th
person $e_j$ is the eigenvector centrality score for the $j$th person (adjacent to the $i$th person), $\lambda$ (lamda) is a proportionality constant called the eigenvalue, $x_{ij}$ is the value of the relationship composite from the $i$th person (row in the matrix) in the matrix to the $j$th person (column in the matrix). “The equation basically says that each node’s centrality is proportional to the sum of the centralities of the nodes it is adjacent to” (Borgatti et al., 2013, p. 168). $e_i = \lambda \sum_j x_{ij} e_j$ represents the equation for eigenvector centrality.

Eigenvector values are often interpreted in social network analysis as a measure of popularity in the sense that a person with the highest eigenvector centrality is connected to people who are also well connected. This compensates for a person that has fewer connections but could still have a higher score than a person with more connections if the first person is connected to very popular people while the second person’s friends are not as popular (Bonacich & Lloyd, 2015).

**Network density.** Another social network measure of interest when looking at leader emergent behavior is network density. Where centrality measures are singular measurements of an individual in the network; density is a total network measurement. Network density is the number of ties in a network or subgroup in proportion to the total possible number of ties (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Where $G_d$ is the density of the network when $T$ represents the total number of ties or relationships in the network divided by the total possible number of ties in a network, $n \times (n - 1)$, $G_d = \frac{T}{n \times (n - 1)}$ represents the equation for network density.

This measurement is the amount of overall connectedness of a group and an indicator of shared network trust and influence among the group members. In this study, a high density could reflect the social influential processes in the group so that the more
dense a group is the more social influence could occur and encourage a group member to
display leader emergent behavior or constrain them from emerging as a leader. If a dense
network shares responsibilities of leadership, more opportunities to lead would occur,
creating a natural environment in which members would show high levels of leadership
emergence to other group members (Mayo et al., 2003).

**Ego networks.** Ego networks are a special type of network built around a single
actor, the ego, including the actors they are adjacent or connected to, also known as
alters, and all the links among those alters (Everett & Borgatti, 2005). Ego networks
offer some large benefits to researchers. Ego networks can be extracted from a larger
organizational network and are reflective of the ego’s perception of the various
influences, which occur in the organization (Borgatti et al., 2013). This is helpful in
tracking potential social psychological influence because the ego is acting on the
perception of the group’s social opportunities not necessarily the real opportunities that
may or may not exist. Ego networks are also limited in size. As organizational networks
become larger, the relationships and organizational network can become more
complicated and complex, but in an ego network the network size of influence is limited
to the first-degree relationships and connections among the alters.

**Ego networks and homophily.** In this study I will be looking at how a
follower’s social ties are associated with his or her organizational commitment,
organizational engagement, and emergent leadership behavior. There is a tendency for
followers to choose to associate or form strong relationships with other people that share
like-minded ideas within their organization. This social psychological force of creating
relationships with like minded people is known as homophily (Borgatti et al., 2013). I
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expect to find homophily based on the attitudes of organizational members, which is the strong social tendency for followers to seek out ties with other followers who are similar to the follower in socially significant ways creating clusters and pockets of people in the social network with similar attitudes about organizational commitment and engagement (McPherson et al., 2001; Snijders, Lomi, & Torlo, 2013).

Balkundi and Kilduff (2006) believed the social circle surrounding any individual fundamentally affects all other network relationships a leader uses to exercise influence. Both structural hole theory (Burt, 1992) and Granovetter’s work on the usefulness and strength of weak ties (1973, 1983) (weak ties being casual acquaintances and social connections) have suggested people with wide and diverse ego networks gain benefit of access to novel information and access to resources or social connections not available to everyone in the group. Structural hole theory and weak ties theory also have been shown to have an effect on individual promotion within organizations (Burt, 1992).

Ego networks and influence. Ego networks also contribute an interesting view of the social psychological forces because there is a strong pressure in organizations for people to agree with personal friends about values and ideas. Social network analysis techniques help inform the understanding of social identity theory and prototypicality through identifying the strength of relationships between followers which reveal the patterns of influence in the organization (Haslam, 2001; Mayo et al., 2003; Subašić, Reynolds, Turner, Veenstra, & Haslam, 2011). Both formal and informal leaders must often challenge the status quo or the current hegemony while embedded in a group of like-minded individuals. It is extremely difficult for informal or emergent leaders to move against social forces, resist social pressures, and guide the collective towards a new
set of values, tasks, or goals (Krackhardt & Kilduff, 1990). Interestingly, Simmel (1950) showed that whether an ego is embedded in a group of three people or one much larger in size the social pressure is the same. The pressure is considered very powerful and it places a significant amount of stress on the leader or group member. However, when a leader is a member of several social groups within the organization the social stresses multiply. So, it is not the size of the ego’s group that is important but it is the number of social groups the ego is a member of and their perception of the difficulty in balancing the differing values and goals of the various groups the leader is expected to represent.

Pescosolido (2001) showed that informal leaders influenced team efficacy and revealed that emerging leaders affected how group members evaluated their own abilities to perform work-related tasks. He extended his study and demonstrated that informal leaders also have a substantial impact on group member’s emotions (Pescosolido, 2002). Both emotion and efficacy have an effect on team performance (Barsade, 2002; Gibson & Vermeulen, 2003). In the absence of formal leadership, informal emergent leaders become more important and based on their ties within the organization they may have a considerable influence on the organization and the success of the organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006).

**Ego network diversity and leadership.** Ego network diversity can also create perceived power in an organization. Brass (1985) looked at the systematic sponsoring of subordinates in an organizational mentorship program. Those subordinates that were introduced and lead in developing relationships with people of a different demographic makeup (gender, age, and ethnic background) had a stronger sense of
perceived influence by other organizational members. This perceived influence also generated the perception of strong social power.

Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass (1998) looked at how members of socially underrepresented people groups tend to form homophiliy networks among their organization and then experienced discrimination from group members that represent the demographic majority makeup of the group. Higgins and Kram (2001) and D. A. Thomas (1993) showed that diversity of an ego network created by mentors intentionally guiding subordinates to connect with people of differing demographic makeup expands and generates new ideas to benefit both the mentor and the subordinate.

**Ego network and commitment.** Roberts and O'Reilly (1979) looked at three highly technical military organizations and demonstrated that isolates, or people selectively creating extremely narrow ego networks (usually a single relation connected the ego to the larger group), expressed low commitment to the organization, often withheld information, experienced less job satisfaction with their job, and received lower performance ratings. H. Oh, Chung, and Labianca (2004) expanded this study to a 60 team field study and showed similar effects when teams are isolated. Teams showed a decline in effectiveness when isolated from the larger group. H. Oh, Chung, and Labianca encouraged organizational leaders to create teams by looking at social connections within and outside the created team so each group member brought intellectual resources to the group as well as social resources.

**Ego network and leader emergent behavior.** Social network analysis has created opportunities for researchers to look at antecedents of leader emergent behavior in a distributed leadership environment in a more restricted and narrowed view of the
relationships and social connections, which foster leadership emergence. Conger and Pearce (2003) looked at studying leadership through the lens of a network theory and how network theory enables researchers to look at the social forces that could have a significant impact on a group of followers and the leadership emergence that could develop from the group of followers.

**Social networks and leadership.** Krackhardt (1990) discovered most leaders do not possess an accurate mental map of their social networks. A leader's cognitive understanding of their social network can affect the leader’s ability to encourage and leverage relationships and workgroups. Inaccurate perceptions of a network structure could lead to missed opportunities for leaders to use their connections to have access to resources or communicate ideas clearly. This can interrupt and have negative effects on leader effectiveness (Kilduff & Tsai, 2003). Accuracy of cognitive network map can also be tied to the use of power in organizations (Brass, 2001). Brass also suggested there is a synergistic process expected of effective leaders to connect to the power of others and to join others together through an accurate knowledge of the network.

Leadership becomes a much more fluid concept in organizational environments and may not resemble the implicit leadership prototypes with which most people are familiar (Bass & Avolio, 1989; Engle & Lord, 1997). Leadership behavior may come from other group members not in formal leader positions but operating in the established network. This creates a certain amount of ambiguity and group members that assist other group members in understanding and adding meaning to the relational ambiguity could be participating in one of the antecedents to become an emergent leader within a group when formal leadership is absent (Conger & Pearce, 2003).
Leaders must be mindful of integration and collaboration within workgroups and they should be prepared to be a hub of communication (Alvesson, 1992; Locke, 2003). Emergent leaders in organizations are typically recognized by separating themselves from the collective by task performance; however, to continue effectively exercising leadership within a group, they will need to develop abilities to foster collaboration (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003). Group members are looking for leaders who demonstrate a collectivist outlook and perform self-sacrificing behavior (B. van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). These kinds of acts are recognized by the network and workgroup and assist the emergent leader in solidifying their position in the network through developed trust.

**Social networks creation and organizational culture.** As mentioned earlier in the organizational engagement portion of this section, culture has a strong effect on group member engagement, and culture is related to network properties such as cohesion, power, and trust (Parkhe, Wasserman, & Ralston, 2006). W. E. Baker (2000) believed network building cannot be forced but only encouraged through a culture of support in modeling expected behaviors and values. Culture creates networks, but networks will also assist in developing positive organizational culture.

Developing organizational energy involves authentic human connection. These types of connections need both the presence and the attention of a leader (Hallowell, 1999). This is also very similar to Saks (2006) model of organizational engagement. The development of organizational energy requires compelling goals, the possibility of member contribution, sense of engagement, perceived progress, and the belief that the team can succeed (R. L. Cross & Parker, 2004). These dimensions of organizational
energy are related to transformational leadership elements (Bass, 1991; R. L. Cross & Parker, 2004).

House and Dessler (1974) showed how leaders who model and value the sharing of information and ideas in their workgroup will encourage followers to do the same, creating information flow through the network. This type of information flow from followers is valuable but it also demonstrates recognition and contribution of group members to reach goals, which has a positive effect on the self-efficacy of group members. Kilduff and Tsai (2003) proposed the idea that leaders should build their networks by setting goals and inviting group members to help achieve those goals thus continuing to build a network of followers from those willing to commit to reaching the goal.

Physical and temporal proximity seem to affect the emergence and spread of developing networks. Borgatti and Cross (2003) found physical closeness mediated the relationship between egos. Monge and Eisenberg (1987) believed proximity ties are easier to maintain and create and thus are typically stronger and more stable. Proximity creates the opportunity to forge relationships and connections between group members (Brass & Krackhardt, 1999).

leaders can do to build trust within their networks. The 10 behaviors are matching word and deed, communicating well and clearly, giveaway items of value, refine ideas, be transparent in the decision-making process, etc. When group members build trust within their social network, they may be recognized more often as emergent leaders within their social network than others that do not intentionally build trust.

Klein, Lim, Saltz, and Mayer (2004) found that value congruence helped foster networks. As people vocalize and demonstrate the internalization of values of the organization, social identity theory posits a member becomes more prototypical and could be identified as an emergent leader within the group. Additionally, when group members are valued by leaders and other group members, collaborative subgroups naturally form (Gilley, Eggland, & Gilley, 2002). R. L. Cross and Parker (2004) looked at how leaders seldom utilize their social network to model expected behavior, thus the potential of the network for collaboration goes underutilized.

Summary. Social network analysis gives organizational and leadership researchers a series of techniques to look at the social connections between followers and organizational members. These social connections are the means by which followers can influence each other and observe emergent leadership behaviors in their peers. Social connections and friendships do not randomly form in groups these connections are often formed from follower proximity and shared like-mindedness. Social network analysis can then be used to evaluate the social connections and establish correlations between follower’s friendships, his or her place in the organization’s social network, and emergent leadership behavior.
Conclusion

This chapter has provided a background of the theories and prominent studies that have advanced and supported the concepts used in this research. The theory of followers and followership from Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) interprets the follower as a position and followership as a social process, which creates the specific context of emergent leadership and emergent leadership behavior of followers in an organization. Followers separate themselves from their peers through emergent leadership behavior as informal leaders and this study examines the traits and social behaviors that allow organizational members to emerge or be held back from informal leadership.

Theories of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and organizational engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2002) focus on the followers’ attitude about their organization that should have a direct influence whether a follower would step out from the rest of the group to lead. Organizational commitment and organizational engagement are the traits this study measures to examine the followers from the position of subordinate in the leadership process. But followership theory also accounts for a constructionist view by which leadership is created through the relationship between follower and leader. Relationships between followers and leaders can be examined and studied using social network theories.

The social context of followers plays an important role for group members that emerge from their peers as a leader (Emery et al., 2013). Social network theory shows how the relationships between followers and how a follower’s position in the social network can have an impact on if and in what way a person emerges as an informal leader (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011; Li, 2013). One of the social forces that permit followers
to recognize peers as leaders is prototypicality, which is a cognitive process that categorizes people based on the perception of how much a group member reflects the beliefs, ideal, and values of the rest of the group (Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008). If a member does not reflect the beliefs, ideal, and values of the organization the emerging leader will be restricted in his or her ability to lead.

Finally, social network theories and social network analysis give social scientists an opportunity to quantify relationships in groups (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). The social constructionist view of leadership looks at the relationships between followers and the consequences the relationships have on group processes (Meindl, 1995). A person’s social position in the network and his or her direct peer relationships influences the capacity to lead and to be recognized as an emerging leader. The social network is where trust is developed and peer recognition of emergent leadership behavior happens which is the focus of this study.

Moving forward, this paper continues through Chapter Three, which will explain the three-phase convergent mixed method approach of the study used to conduct the research. Chapter Four reviews the results of the quantitative data collection from phase one and two and Chapter Five examines the results of the qualitative data collection from phase three, addressing how followers give or receive permission for leaders to emerge in their social groups. Chapter Six will review the results of the findings; answer the research questions guiding this study, and offer recommendations for future research and practical implications of the findings.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This complementary mixed methods study uses a three-phase convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data. The convergence of data types allows both types of collected data to provide different insights and allows the study to examine the problem from multiple angles as well as perspectives (Creswell, 2015). This study has been divided into three-phases to simplify the data collection procedures and to keep the complex components of the study contained in three sections for easy reporting.

The first phase is a small set of initial interviews to establish what behaviors and activities promote relationships in the organization. The second phase is a survey used to establish social network measures from relationship data in the church as well as measure the multivariate associations between the dependent and independent variables. The final phase is a more substantial set of interviews to determine and evaluate the leadership narrative of the local congregation. Figure 3.1 shows an overview of the convergent design of this study.
Figure 3.1. Convergent Design Overview

Figure 3.1. Overview of the complementary mixed methods study using a three-phase convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data.

Participants

All participants of this study were members, attenders, or paid staff over the age of 18 in a medium sized church in the south-central region of the United States. The first phase, initial interviews, were conducted with two formal and two informal leaders within the organization. Each person was asked to participate in a short 25-minute semi-structured interview to determine types of relationship data used in the social network analysis.

A potential roster of participants was provided by the organization by combining the most recent mailing list from the church and the most current church directory of attenders. The roster was offered to me as a Microsoft Excel® (2011) spreadsheet, which included names, emails, mailing addresses, and phone numbers for each person. The
roster was culled by removing anyone under the age of eighteen and members who had moved away to produce a total of 170 people that were asked to participate in the study. It is important to understand that organizations like churches are dynamic and can fluctuate in size over time and throughout the year. If this study had been conducted in previous years the amount of people invited to participate could have been greater or less than the amount of people included in this study. A high response rate of 150 (88.2%) attempted to complete the basic demographic and social network analysis survey but only 122 of surveys were usable. The unusable surveys were either incomplete or a duplicate. One of the participants completed the survey twice but the duplicate survey was removed during data cleaning. The average organizational membership tenure was 17.8 years (SD = 13.93). The average length of time a member has lived in the community where the church is located is 25.3 years (SD = 14.52). Of those that responded to the survey, 50 (41.0%) identified themselves as male and 72 (59.0%) identified themselves as female, which is very similar to the overall categorical breakdown of the church. The survey shows an evenly educated group of participants seven (5.7%) reported holding a master’s degree, 49 (40.2%) undergraduate degrees, 65 (53.3%) completing high school, and one (0.8%) doctoral degree.

In the third phase, fourteen participants were selected for interpretive interviews based on centrality values calculated from the social network analysis (SNA). The interpretive interview component of this study follows a qualitative frame to evaluate and collect emergent leadership narratives and personal experiences from the local church.
Institutional Review Board

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects at the University of Central Arkansas approved all methods and procedures for the study. The IRB application is included in Appendix A.

Instruments and Measures

The survey instrument for the study was made up of five sections used to measure the variables in the study - Organizational Commitment (OC), Organizational Engagement (OE), Leader Emergent Behavior (LEB), social relationships and basic demographic information of participants. Details of each section and variables are described in the following paragraphs.

Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment was measured using the three-component model developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Each component measures a different type of commitment that affects how organizational members interpret their obligation to their community of faith. The composite OC variable was made up of the three minor variables, and each minor variable, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment, was also examined independently. The OC measure utilized a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The coefficient alpha for the affective commitment scale is .87 (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The sum of the 18 questions from this instrument makes up the composite OC scores, which creates a range of measure from 18 to 126. Affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment are created by
adding together the six questions from the instrument that corresponds to each of the minor variables. Each of these scores can range from six to 42.

**Organizational Engagement.** The 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was used in this study to determine organizational member’s personal engagement with the community of faith. Engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by three minor variable components: vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Each component of the scale measures a different type of engagement that members use to feel positive and personally fulfilled from belonging to the community of faith. The composite OE variable is made up of the three minor variables scores; each individual minor variable was examined independently. The OE measure utilized a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” Internal consistencies of this instrument typically range between .80 and .90 (Schaufeli et al., 2006). The sum of the 17 questions of this instrument makes up the OE scores, which creates a range from 17 to 119. The minor variables vigor scale and absorption scales ranged from six to 42, while the dedication scale has a range from five to 35.

**Leader Emergent Behavior.** This study used five items from the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) to identify leader emergence behavior (LEB) as providing organizational vision, inspiration, new ideas, recognize opportunities, and group goal creation. Participants were asked to rate themselves and the peers with whom they have a significant relationship within the organization. The Conger and Kanungo’s scale measures the degree of leadership emergence as a continuous variable. The original instrument reported a Cronbach’s alpha = .81 (Conger et al., 2000)
and the items being used has typically shown a narrow range varying from 0.88 to 0.91 (Conger & Kanungo, 1994). This study measures LEB utilizing a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” A self-reported score is created by the sum of the values reported from a self-reflecting evaluation; these scores ranged from five to 35. Participants that identified having a strong or significant relationship with another organizational member were asked to evaluate LEB in their peers using the same LEB scale. Using the Conger and Kanungo instrument, the mean of all LEB scores from other participants was used to create a peer LEB score.

**Centrality.** The final set of variables used in this study come from the social network analysis (SNA) that determines relationships and strength of relationships between the organizational members. Since leadership is fundamentally a relational process, centrality measures reveal the infrastructure of people in the organization that reveal the relationships by which the leadership process can occur (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). In this study the centrality measures of the participants within the social network structure are the most influential persons in the organization (Klein et al., 2004). This social network analysis consists of three parts. First, participants identify whom they know from a roster of members provided by organizational leaders. This determines weak ties or social acquaintances. Next the participants were asked to identify five to 15 members whom they feel close to or the strong ties they have with other organizational members. The last part of the analysis asks participants to evaluate members they nominated as strong ties using the Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale. This is the same instrument as mentioned above except the participant evaluates their peers that they have identified as strong ties and significant relationships within the organization.
Procedures

This study has been divided into three-phases to simplify the data collection procedures and reporting. This section discusses the three major procedures used to assemble the data for this study.

Initial Interviews. The initial interviews in the first phase were set up to determine the types of activities and behaviors valued within the organization which foster social connections between members of the organization. Two formal and two informal leaders within the organization were asked to participate in a short 25-minute semi-structured interview. I went over the interview consent form and asked each participant to sign the form before his or her interview. The consent form is included in Appendix B. Each participant was given a copy of the consent form with the researcher’s and dissertation chair’s contact information. Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded. A values coding technique assisted in identifying the participant’s values, attitudes, and beliefs of their perspective of activities and behaviors that contribute to relationships in the organization (Saldaña, 2013). These relationship activities and behaviors are used in the electronic survey instrument to help establish the variable strength levels of relational ties between organizational members (Borgatti et al., 2013). The following list of questions was established as the protocol for the initial interviews. My protocol form for the initial interviews is included in Appendix C.

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?
2. Please list for me some of the people that you are closest to in this organization?

<List generation>
3. From the list of people you gave me, can you describe the relationship that you have with each person? <Go through each person they listed asking to carefully and specifically define that specific type of relationship>

4. How and when were each of these relationships formed? <Go back through the list>

5. Are there any others you would like to add to this list?

The data collected from the initial interviews in phase one were interpreted to determine the relationship behaviors, beliefs, and activities, which promote and maintain the social networks within the church. These data were used in the second phase to conduct a social network analysis that examines the social connectivity of the members within the organization. The second phase utilized a cross-sectional survey research design to collect self-reported data of OC, OE, LEB, and social network measures.

Initial interviews were transcribed to determine personal value, attitude, or belief about the relationships in the church. Participants’ personal accounts were divided into topics and subjects based on relationship formations in the church. The personal experience of behaviors and expectations from friendships in the local church were of special interest. These accounts were sorted into major categories and then subgroups were created from the categories of value, attitude, and belief. A horizontal reading and topic review was conducted to determine continuity in the initial coding efforts. These personal reflections and ideas grouped together reveal the common and shared beliefs and attitudes the people share in their social group (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

After categorization and horizontal reading, I reflected on the statements and groups of statements to determine their collective meaning, interaction, and interplay
working under the premise that the friendship and relational constructs are a part of an interconnected belief system the group shares. By conducting several interviews and then sorting values, beliefs, and attitudes of individuals about friendships in the church, patterns began to emerge that are reflective of the group’s collective ideas about how relationships work in the church. The collected and coded information was used to determine the valued relationship types and the behaviors that establish the network ties used in identifying the social connections, which creates the organization’s informal social structure. The following factors were used in constructing the social network of the church; they intentionally connect with me; they are available when I need help; I can trust this person; we share activities outside of the community; we serve the community together, and I consider this person a personal friend. These relationship factors are used to establish relational ties between organizational members.

Survey. After the initial interviews were completed, phase two began with the construction of the survey instrument based from the findings in the initial interviews. The survey was reviewed and approved by the pastor and staff leaders of the community of faith as well as the University of Central Arkansas Institutional Review Board. After the survey was approved, I administered the survey to most participants as an electronic survey through the email addresses of church members and attenders. A survey informed consent form was constructed at the beginning of the survey (see Appendix D) to be printed off and kept by participants. Participants could not proceed with the survey without indicating they had read and understood the informed consent agreement. The church leaders provided email addresses in the form of the roster to be used for distribution of the electronic survey. Identical paper surveys were made available for
those with limited computer and Internet access or skills. The electronic and paper surveys included a letter of introduction asking for organizational member participation in the study. The letter explained the purpose of the study and that the study was completely voluntary; participants that did not wish to be a part of the study were asked not to complete the survey. Paper surveys were distributed in envelopes and participants were asked to return the survey in the same envelope to ensure privacy and confidentiality of all participants. The items of the survey can be seen in Appendix E. As an incentive, a $50 dollar gift card was given to participants through a weekly drawing from all participants that had completed the survey up to that point. After surveys were completed and turned in, paper surveys were combined with the online electronic surveys and the names of participants were removed from the surveys and replaced with a participant number to preserve confidentiality.

The survey distributed in phase two collected three types of data: first, general demographic information; second, dependent and independent variables OC, OE, and LEB data; and third, social network relationship data between organizational members. Normally this type of procedure would require multiple surveys, which would introduce survey fatigue and participant attrition. So, the design of the survey combined the collection of all sets of data to maximize participation from organizational members.

A social network analysis was conducted to determine centrality values in the social structure of the church. Twenty participants were selected with the highest eigenvector centrality values and the top fourteen were used in the interviews with six members set aside as backup interviews. The selected participants were invited to be involved in the interpretive interviews to determine the leadership narratives and discuss
personal experiences with leaders and leading in the organization. So, the interpretive interviews established the emergent leadership narrative from socially connected people in the organization. It is important to remember that the participants interviewed may or may not be the recognized or formal leaders within the organization, but they are highly connected members, which gives them a higher level of social access to stories and information about leadership in the organization collected in the interpretive interviews (Klein et al., 2004).

**Interpretive Interviews.** The interpretive interviews helped ensure accuracy of the social network analysis as well as collect the emergent leadership narrative from well-connected people in the organization. The fourteen participants were selected based on centrality values calculated from the SNA. The interpretive interview component of this study used a qualitative frame to collect personal experiences and the emergent leadership narrative shared by the organization. The following list of questions established the protocol for the interpretive interviews. The protocol form for the interpretive interviews is included in Appendix F.

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?
2. Could you list for me some of the people you are closest to in this organization?

<List generation to compare to social network map created by the survey>
3. From the people you listed, who would you say are leaders in the organization?
4. How do those you have listed stand out from other organizational members?
5. Can you share with me some activities or behaviors each person you have identified has done to establish him or her as a leader?
6. Is there anything you would like to share with me about any of the people you identified in the organization?

The final set of interviews was used to draw out experiences and accounts of emergent leadership behaviors and how the church members informally recognize leaders or how leaders emerge within the organization, which are the two process necessary in creating the social construct of leadership (Carsten et al., 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The interviews gave the participants opportunity to share their personal accounts of what they have witnessed as their peers have emerged as leaders from among the rest of the organization’s members. Stories and accounts were gathered to give interpretations of the characteristics, traits, activities, and behaviors that matched the expectation of the church in order to be a leader. These stories also allow participants to give accounts of emerging leaders that were prevented from taking on the role of leader in the organization by members choosing not to support or follow the emerging leader. These accounts position events and people in the church during specific times and create an order to make sense of what happened (or a personal interpretation of what has happened) in the leadership process at the church. I am using the narratives to explain or normalize the leadership events that have occurred in the recent past in an attempt to present why leadership is the way it is or it has been the way it is in the church. So, the oral accounts of each person’s experiences are gathered and sorted and interpreted to determine the leadership narrative of the organization.

The individual narratives and accounts of particular events were combined to provide meaning of those events and give a fuller richer understanding to the quantitative data collected from the survey (Creswell, 2015). Data collected in this portion of the
The final interview set was transcribed and coded to identify successful and unsuccessful emergent leadership behavior in the organization’s history. The second set of interviews were analyzed using an evaluation coding technique (Saldaña, 2013; D. R. Thomas, 2006). The technique uses non-quantitative codes that assign judgment about merit and worth or significance of leadership activity in social network structure. Evaluation coding is appropriate for policy, action, organizational and evaluation studies (Patton, 2014; Saldaña, 2013).

The evaluation coding technique is similar to the values coding method used in the initial set of interviews from phase one. Participants’ statements were categorized into topics and subtopics based on statements reflecting the participant’s personal value, attitude, or belief about leadership and leadership experiences in the local church. The evaluation coding adds an additional level of analysis by noting the magnitude of the participant’s reflections. This additional label indicating the participant’s reflections as a positive or negative allowing for quick sorting positive and negative experience.
Recording the magnitude of the participant’s reflections is very useful when combining 14 participants’ experiences on emergent leadership behavior. For example, two participants may share a similar experience indicating that they were assigned a task and were left alone to complete the task. For one participant, this could be a positive experience seen as an exercise of trust, while the other participant could interpret it as a negative experience because they felt abandoned or isolated.

Participant recommendations and ideas of general improvements were labeled separately. This category is very valuable because it not only represents and reflects the participant’s experiences but his or her critical and analytical evaluations of specific personnel, events, and leadership experiences within the organization. Those recommendations take into account the participant’s own reflection but also allows the participant to partner with me as the researcher in identifying the collective understanding of leadership. Four distinct processes are used to make sense of the collected data: analysis of patterns, interpretation of significance, judgment of results, and recommendations (D. R. Thomas, 2006). The goal in evaluation coding is to determine what is working and what is not, and to give an overall idea of the collective narrative of how leadership is functioning or not functioning in the church. Recommendations from participants were collected from the interviews and all personal identifiers were removed and after this study is complete will be given to the formal leaders of the church to assist them in leadership development.

**Conclusion**

This chapter provided an overview of the participants and procedures used to obtain the quantitative and qualitative data for this study. The chapter also reviewed the
scales and instruments to measure the explanatory and response variables and the qualitative procedures and protocols to collect the narrative data. The following chapter will discuss the statistical methods used to analyze the quantitative data collected from the survey and the social network analysis data given by participants and report the results of each of the analyses. Chapter Five will report the results of the third phase of this study, the emergent leadership narratives, for this particular community of faith. Chapter Six will interpret the results found in this study by combining both the quantitative and qualitative data. This interpretation will be discussed and conclusions drawn from the data to complete this analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter focuses primarily on the first two phases of this complementary mixed methods study which is using a three-phase convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data (Creswell, 2015). The study has been divided into three phases to simplify the data collection procedures and to keep the complexity of the various components of this study contained in separate sections for easy reporting.

The first two phases look at the results of the initial interviews and relationship between organizational commitment, organizational engagement, and leader emergence behavior. The third phase focuses on the emergent leadership experiences and narratives as perceived by organizational members and those results are covered in Chapter Five.

This chapter begins with addressing the results of the initial interviews, phase one, to establish the foundation of relationships shared among the members of the community of faith. It then covers the descriptive statistics from the survey that describes the population of the community of faith in this study. The chapter then moves into the statistical methods used to analyze the quantitative data collected in this study during the phase two surveys described in the previous chapter. Phase three qualitative results focusing on emergent leadership narratives are found in the Chapter Five. A summary of results is presented at the end of this chapter.

Phase One - Initial Interviews

Although this chapter focuses primarily on quantitative data collection and interpretation, social network analysis is normally viewed as a mixed method by itself and is often comprised of three parts, an initial interview to determine valued
relationships, relational survey to determine who is relationally connected to whom, and an interpretive interview that can act as a check for accuracy of the data collection (Borgatti et al., 2013; J. E. Cross et al., 2009). It was essential to do some ethnographic background research to explore the fundamental character of the social relationships within the community of faith. Collective behaviors, actions, and valued beliefs of the participants must be determined in order to understand how the social network is formed and sustained in the organization. A short qualitative study was set up to determine what types of relationships are most valued within the social connections between members of the organization. Two formal and two informal leaders, two women and two men, within the organization were asked to participate in a short 25-minute semi-structured interview. The following questions established the protocol for the interviews.

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?
2. Please list for me some of the people that you are closest to in this organization?

[A list was generated]

3. From the list of people you gave me, can you describe the relationship that you have with each person? [Participants went through each person they listed from the previous question. I asked about each person on the list, asking the participant to carefully and specifically define that specific type of relationship they shared with each person they listed]
4. How and when were each of these relationships formed? [We went back through each person on the list]
5. Are there any others you would like to add to this list? [Opportunity to add
Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded using the values coding technique that classifies organizational members’ values, attitudes, and beliefs, representing their perspective of relationship types that contribute to the social connections in the organization (Saldaña, 2013). Data that was collected and coded from the interviews was used to determine the valued relationship types that establish the network ties. These social connections form the basis for the organization’s informal leadership structure.

The questions from the interview protocol have generated a set of qualitative participant reflections. They were used to create a descriptive set of data to understand what is valued and important to the members of the church. The particular questions that were the most informative were, “Please list for me some of the people that you are closest to in this organization?” This question gave opportunity for interviewees to list those people in the organization they perceive to have the strongest social connections. “From the list of people you gave me, can you describe the relationship that you have with each person?” This question allowed for stories and rich descriptive understanding of the perceived relationships and why those relationships were formed. And finally, “How and when were each of these relationships formed?” gave me an idea of the genesis of the relationships and the foundational moments that were important to the participant in forming the relationship.

After recording, transcribing and coding the data, I recognized a strong pattern revealed through the interviews showing that members of the organization reflected on social relationships and social expectations in two ways, normative and actual.
Participants had a normative list of expectations of what members ought to do in a very idealistic manner. Some of those normative constructs were: people should intentionally connect with me; people should take the time and know me and not just know about me; we should share and enjoy common activities, and we should treat each other like family. These phrases are examples of some of the more common normative themes found through the interview. Participants also revealed very specific ideas and actual behaviors that were important to them in forming relationships in the organization. Where the normative ideas of how relationships are formed and sustained represented an ideology, the actual themes represented the day-to-day activities that are important in sustaining the social network in the community of faith. A table of the most common themes and the frequencies of those themes between all four interviews are listed in Table 4.1. Each of the themes and ideas represented in the table were represented in a large capacity in all four interviews.
Table 4.1

*Frequency Chart of the Top Ideas and Behaviors Valued Collectively by the Community of Faith*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important relationship factors</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency Counts Between Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available When I Need Help</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Consider This Person a Personal Friend</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Share Activities outside Community</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Intentionally Connect with Me</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Trust This Person</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have shared life experiences</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They know me and not just about me</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have shared in a crisis</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We eat together</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Serve Together Inside Community</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the frequency and resolute ideas of what behaviors and expectations make up the relationships in the community of faith the social network of the organization could be identified and measured quantitatively. The following factors were used in the relationship survey to construct the social network of the church; they intentionally connect with me; they are available when I need help; I can trust this person; we share activities outside of the community; we serve the community together, and I consider this
person a personal friend. This establishes the important factors that make up the relationships within this particular community of faith. So now when a participant identifies a person as a close or personal friend on the relationship component of the survey, the participant has the opportunity to evaluate that relationship by each of the important factors identified from the interviews on a seven-point Likert Scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Those scores from the individual factors are then combined together to further create strength of relationship composite. This composite is the quantitative measure for the social network analysis discussed later in this chapter.

**Phase Two - Survey Data Analysis**

Once all the surveys were collected, the data from the surveys were entered into Microsoft Excel® for sorting and data cleaning and then converted to comma-separated values spreadsheet files to be used in R statistical software package version 3.1.1 build 6784 for analysis (Team, 2014). The analysis used to examine the collected quantitative survey data was Pearson’s product-moment correlation, standard multiple regression analysis, and forward and backward multiple regression analysis. A social network analysis was performed on the relational data using UCINET software version 6.567 (Borgatti et al., 2002) to determine degree and eigenvector centrality measures, homophily, and network density measures.

Pearson’s product-moment correlation is a measurement of the linear correlation between two variables. The results are given as a value between +1 and −1, where +1 is a total positive correlation, 0 is a reflection of no correlation, and −1 is a total negative correlation. Correlation values between the self-reported emergent leadership behavior
and organizational commitment including the organizational commitment subscales (affective, normative, and continuance commitment) were calculated using the Pearson’s product-moment correlation. A similar evaluation of organizational engagement including the organizational engagement subscales (vigor, dedication, and absorption) was also conducted using Pearson’s product-moment correlation.

The combined effects of organizational commitment and organizational engagement on self-reported leadership emergence behavior were tested using multiple regressions. A multiple regression is a statistical test used to estimate the relationships among variables. It is used to help researchers understand how the typical value of the dependent variable, self-reported leadership emergence behavior, changes when any one of the independent or explanatory variables, organizational commitment and organizational engagement, is varied, while the other independent variables are unchanged.

The initial multiple regression technique between organizational commitment (OC), organizational engagement (OE), and self-reported leadership emergence behavior SRLEB lead to subsequence analysis run on the subscales of the organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance commitment) and organizational engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption). This analysis was exploratory in nature but allowed a much more accurate assessment of OC and OE and the roles each variable played in producing emergent leadership behavior. Forward and backwards regressions were used to establish the best model reflective of the collected data.

In a forward regression technique the explanatory variables or subscales are entered into the equation one at a time based on which variable increases the explanatory
power to the model. When a forward regression is used a variable is added when the variable significantly predicts variance in the dependent variable with an alpha level of .05 or less. A backwards regression technique starts with all potential explanatory variables in the model and each variable is tested and the explanatory variable with the least significance is removed. In the backwards regression technique a variable is only removed from the larger model if the alpha level remains equal to or less than .10 (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). Both processes, forward and backward, are repeated until the model with the best explanatory power is revealed.

Survey Results

The population of the study was expected to be between 150 to 200 females and males over the age of 18. The roster of participants was cleaned and culled to produce a total of 170 people that were asked to participate in the study. Potential participants were removed from the population if they no longer lived in the local town or attended the church. Other participants were removed from the roster if they were under the age of 18. A high response rate of 150 (88.2%) completed the basic demographic and SNA portion of the survey but unfortunately because of incomplete surveys only 122 of the 170 potential surveys (71.8%) were usable.

Descriptive Statistics. Summary statistics of each variable used in the study is tabulated in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

*Descriptive Statistics for Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment (OC)</td>
<td>91.22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>123.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Affective</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Normative</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Continuance</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Engagement (OE)</td>
<td>90.52</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Vigor</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Dedication</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Absorption</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRLEB</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=122

**Results of Reliability Tests.** A Cronbach’s Alpha test was run to examine the survey scales reliability in this study. A reliability coefficient of .70 or greater is considered a statistical sufficient level of reliability. All scales but one scale, continuance commitment, in the study achieved levels of .70 or higher (see Table 4.3). The inability for the continuance commitment scale to reach the reliability standards could be a result of how participants cognitively frame their commitment to their community of faith.
Table 4.3

*Cronbach’s Alpha for Research Scale and Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment (OC)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Affective</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Normative</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Continuance</td>
<td>.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Engagement (OE)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Vigor</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Dedication</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE Absorption</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRLEB</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not meet .70 or higher threshold of reliability

Tests of the Hypotheses

**Hypotheses 1a and 1b**

$H_{1a}$: Organizational commitment will have a positive relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior. That is, the higher the commitment to the organization, the higher the self-reported leader emergence behavior.

$H_{1b}$: Organizational engagement will have a positive relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior. That is, the higher the engagement in the organization, the higher the self-reported leader emergence behavior.
Pearson’s product-moment correlations were used to test hypotheses of how OC and OE related to the outcome of SRLEB. Correlations scores between all variables, including subscales, are available in Table 4.4.

The first hypothesis (H1a) predicted organizational commitment would have a positive relationship with self-reported emergent leadership behavior. The results show that OC does have a positive relationship with SRLEB but only a slight correlation between the two variables ($r=.22, df=120, p < .01$). The second hypothesis (H1b) predicted organizational engagement would have a positive relationship with self-reported emergent leadership behavior. The results show that OE does have a positive relationship with SRLEB and it is much stronger in correlation than organizational commitment ($r=.49, df=120, p < .01$).
Table 4.4

*Summary of Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlations for All Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Org. Commitment (OC)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OC Affective</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OC Normative</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OC Continuance</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.00†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Org. Engagement (OE)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OE Vigor</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OE Dedication</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OE Absorption</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SRLEB</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†p > .05

**Hypotheses 1c**

\[ H_{1c} \]: *Organizational commitment and organizational engagement will have a significant multivariate relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior.*

Standard multiple regressions were run to test the synergistic effects of organizational commitment and organizational engagement on self-reported leadership emergent behavior. The first test was a standard multiple regression using the variables OC and OE outcome on SRLEB. The results indicated OC, \( b = -.06, t(121) = -1.87, p > .06 \), did not significantly reduce the unexplained variance in SRLEB while OE, \( b = .26, \)
\( t(121) = 6.38, \ p < .001 \), did significantly reduce the variance in the scores on the survey’s measure of SRLEB. The two explanatory variables together did describe a significant portion of the variance in SRLEB, \( R^2 = .28, F(2,119) = 23.95, \ p < .001 \) (see Tables 4.5 and 4.6).

Table 4.5

*Model Summary of Regression Analysis for SRLEB with OC and OE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1184.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>592.38</td>
<td>23.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2943.40</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4128.16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***\( p < .001 \)

Table 4.6

*Multiple Regression for SREL with OC and OE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>6.38**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\( p < .01 \)

From the current findings organizational commitment scores did not reflect a significant predictor of self-reported emergent leadership behavior, additional regressions were run using the scores on the subscales of organizational commitment and organizational engagement instead of the larger scales. These regressions were run to determine if any of the six subscales (affective commitment, normative commitment,
continuance commitment, vigor, dedication, and absorption) could significantly forecast self-reported leadership emergence behavior scores. A forward and backward regression was performed to determine the best-fit model made up of the six subscales.

A set of standard multiple regressions were run to test the synergistic effects of six subscales on self-reported leadership emergence behavior. The first test was simply a standard multiple regression using the all subscales that made up OC (affective, normative, and continuance commitment) and OE (vigor, dedication, and absorption) and how they affect the outcome on SRLEB. The results indicated that OE - vigor, \( b = .12, t(121) = .75, p > .06 \) and OE - dedication, \( b = .12, t(121) = .62, p > .06 \), did not significantly reduced the unexplained variance in SRELB. However the subscales OE - absorption, \( b = .52, t(121) = 4.34, p < .001 \), OC - affective, \( b = -.24, t(121) = -2.29, p < .05 \), OC - normative, \( b = .30, t(121) = 2.93, p < .01 \), OC - continuance, \( b = -.34, t(121) = -3.52, p < .001 \) did significantly reduce the variance in the scores on the SRELB survey.

The six explanatory variables described a significant portion of the variance in SRELB, \( R^2 = .38, F(6,115) = 11.73, p < .001 \) (see Table 4.7 and 4.8).

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1567.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>261.22</td>
<td>11.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2560.83</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4128.16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001
Table 4.8

*Multiple Regression for SRELB with All OC and OE Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC - Affective</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-2.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC - Normative</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC - Continuance</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-3.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE - Vigor</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE - Dedication</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE - Absorption</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4.34*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Forward and backwards regressions were used to test the six-item subscale model. These two regression techniques add or remove variables based on set criteria.

The forward regression only entered the variables OE – absorption, OC – continuance, OC – normative, and OC – affective into the model and produced a significant result in SRELB, $R^2 = .37, F(4,117) = 17.01, p < .001$ (see Table 9). The other two variable OE – vigor and OE – dedication were not entered into the equation because there was not strong enough statistical justification of created variance within the outcome on SRELB.

The backwards regression entered all subscale variables into the model and then removed OE – dedication first then followed by OE – vigor. The backwards regression techniques left the study with the same model as the foreward regression technique using the variables OE – absorption, OC – continuance, OC – normative, and OC – affective to best produce a significant variance in SRELB, $R^2 = .37, F(4,117) = 17.01, p < .001$ (see
Tables 4.9 and 4.10).

Table 4.9

Model Summary of Forward and Backward Regression for SRLEB with OE – absorption, OC – continuance, OC – normative, and OC – affective subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1518.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>379.55</td>
<td>17.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2609.95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>412816</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001

Table 4.10

Forward and Backward Regression for SRLEB with OE – absorption, OC – continuance, OC – normative, and OC – affective subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OE - Absorption</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC - Affective</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC - Normative</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC - Continuance</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-4.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Phase Two - Social Network Analysis

The social network of the organization is identified and measured by each organizational member evaluating the behaviors and relationship expectations that they have with other members in the community of faith; particularly with those members they have identified with which they have a strong relationship. The following factors
were used in the relationship survey to construct the social network relationship composite of the members in the organization; they intentionally connect with me; they are available when I need help; I can trust this person; we share activities outside of the community; we serve the community together, and I consider this person a personal friend. Again, this establishes the important factors that make up the strength of relationships within this community of faith. So when a participant identifies a person as a close or personal friend in the survey, the participant evaluates the relationship by each of the important factors on a seven-point Likert Scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Those scores from the individual factors are then combined together to create strength of relationship composite. This composite forms the bases of the quantitative measure for the social network analysis discussed in this chapter.

Matrices are used in social network analysis and are often a square, so the matrix contains the same number of rows and columns. Matrices are described by the size indicating the number of rows of elements and columns of elements that they contain. For example, a 4 by 5 matrix has four rows and five columns so an i by j matrix has i rows and j columns. Each cell in the matrix can be identified by the format $x_{ij}$ any value in the matrix is determined by the coordinate values of i and j. The composite relationship values for this study are stored in a 177x177 matrix where each row and column represents participants’ relationships and each specific cell in the matrix describes the strength of the relationship between organizational members. The rows represent the source person of the relationship, and the columns represent the targets of the source person’s relationships. A row in the matrix indicates a participant’s outgoing connections, and identify their perceived strong tie relationships, which is measured as the composite
scores or strength values of that relationship. This matrix is the starting point for most social network analysis. This type of matrix is also called an adjacency matrix because it represents who is next to, or adjacent to whom in the social space mapped by the relationships identified in the survey. An adjacency matrix may be symmetric or asymmetric. A small sample of the social network matrix used in this study is provided (see Table 4.11).

Table 4.11

Sample of the Relationship Matrix of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>001</th>
<th>002</th>
<th>003</th>
<th>004</th>
<th>005</th>
<th>006</th>
<th>007</th>
<th>008</th>
<th>009</th>
<th>010</th>
<th>…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sociogram and link analysis diagram. There are many ways to represent the relationship data in a social network. The relationship matrix in Table 4.11 is one representation that allows for mathematical computations and easy reference of relationships, but it lacks an appealing visual depiction that symbolizes the relationships contained in the network. A simple visual graph or sociogram that symbolically represents nodes (people) and ties (relationships) can be more visually appealing but information is often lost or compromised in building a visual model of the organization.

Sociograms are graphic representations of all the interpersonal relationships
contained in a social organization. Each node or person in the organization is individually represented as a circle in Figure 4.1. The lines represent ties or the interpersonal relationships between people. The arrowheads indicate direction of the relationship. Depending on how the sociograms is created a node’s position in the sociogram could represent the importance, influence, or closeness but in Figure 4.1 the nodes are given as fixed points for ease of explanation and design simplicity.

Sociograms can be useful in identifying unbalanced relationships. It is possible to see unbalanced relationships in sociograms and matrices, where Person A perceives a relationship with Person B as a very strong, but Person B perceives the relationship with person A as merely an acquaintance. This type of unbalanced relationship is not usually common, but it does occur and can show up in social network analysis. Each specific directional line contained in this sociogram represents an empirical value, from the relationship composite contained in the relationship matrix of participants that was created by relationship survey. In smaller sociograms lines can be widened or thinned to represent stronger relationships or varying values in the relationship matrix. Because this study contained 177 nodes there is a possibility of 31,152 different relationships varying in levels of strength. Accurately representing visual differences in a sociogram that large is very difficult.

The following example represents only one node’s (person’s) relationships of 177 possible nodes to demonstrate how quickly sociograms information becomes overwhelming. Again, the simple sociogram only shows one node’s relationships in the network (see Figure 4.1). In the simple sociogram there are six outgoing relationships and five incoming relationships that the node shares with other nodes. These relationships are
easy identified and represented. However, when all the reported relationships are added from the relationship matrix of participants the visual representation quickly becomes cluttered and overwhelming (see Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.1. Simple Sociogram Created From One Node in the Relationship Matrix
The results are an overwhelming amount of relational data in the visualization that are too cumbersome to represent any attempt to visualize the relationships in the organization. The previous two examples (Figures 4.1 and 4.2) also do not attempt to take into account relational closeness of nodes. In fact these two visualizations keep the
nodes on fixed points within the graph, but if an attempt is made to group the nodes together to simplify the visualization so that nodes that share common relationships are represented as spatially closer together, the results are even more difficult to interpret with any accuracy (see Figure 4.3). In this representation each person is positioned in the graph representation based on relational closeness to his or her friends. The closer the node is to the center of the sociogram the more popular or influential the node is in the network. Sociograms can be very informative when representing small networks of less than 30-50 nodes but in larger networks, like in this study, become awkward and difficult to represent the relationship data accurately.
Many researchers use visualizations sparingly for simplicity and clarity or examine subset structures of the network as discussed in Chapter Two so that networks are represented carefully and accurately in visualizations. Network measures are used in this study to describe this particular network rather than rely on visual representation of the collected relational data. All the calculations to determine the network measures such as homophily, or individual node measures like degree, density, and eigenvector are calculated using the relationship matrix of participants represented by Table 4.11.
Tests of the Hypotheses H2a, H2b, and H2c

**H2a**: Organizational members who display high measures in organization commitment will tend to be adjacent (or close) to one another in the organizational network. So, members with high organization commitment will demonstrate group homophily.

**H2b**: Organizational members who display high measures in organization engagement will tend to be adjacent (or close) to one another in the organizational network. So, members with high organization engagement will demonstrate group homophily.

**H2c**: Organizational members who display high measures in self-reported emergent leader identification will tend to be socially distant from one another in the organizational network. So, members with high self-reported emergent leader identification would not demonstrate group homophily.

Homophily Measures

The two measures, Moran's I and Geary's C, are adapted for social network analysis from their origins in geography, where they were developed to measure the extent to which the similarity of the geographical features of any two places was related to the spatial distance between them (Borgatti et al., 2013). The Moran I ranges from -1.0 as a perfect negative correlation through 0 (no correlation) to +1.0 which would be a perfect positive correlation. The Moran statistic is constructed like a regular correlation coefficient. It indexes the product of the differences between the scores of two actors and the mean, then it weights the actor's similarity as a covariance weighted by the closeness of actors. This sum is taken in ratio to the variance in the scores of all actors from the mean. The resulting measure, like the correlation coefficient, is a ratio of covariance to variance, and has a conventional interpretation.

\[
I = \frac{N}{\sum_i \sum_j w_{ij}} \sum_i \sum_j w_{ij} (X_i - \bar{X})(X_j - \bar{X}) \sum_i (X_i - \bar{X})^2
\]

where \(N\) is the number of nodes indexed by \(i\) (horizontal) and \(j\) (vertical) in the relationship matrix, \(X_i\) is the variable of interest for which homophily is being tested for
spatial correlation, $\bar{X}$ is the mean of $X_i$, and $w_{ij}$ is the strength or the weight of the relationship shared between nodes.

The Geary statistic is described in the geo-statistics literature as being more sensitive to local differences than to global differences. The Geary C statistic examines the differences between the scores of actors, and weights this score by the adjacency or proximity of each pair. The Moran I statistic is constructed by looking at differences between each actor's score and the mean, and weighting the cross products. The differences in the approaches mean that the Geary statistic is more focused on how different members of each pair are from each other or the local difference; the Moran statistic is focused more on how the similar or dissimilar each pair are to the overall average which forms a difference from global perspective. The Geary statistic has a value of 1.0 when there is no association. And values less than 1.0 indicate a positive association, values greater than 1.0 indicate a negative association.

$$C = \frac{(N - 1) \sum_i \sum_j w_{ij}(X_i - X_j)^2}{2W \sum_i (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$$

where $N$ is the number of nodes indexed by $i$ (horizontal) and $j$ (vertical) in the relationship matrix, $X_i$ is the variable of interest for which homophily is being tested for spatial correlation, $\bar{X}$ is the mean of $X_i$, $w_{ij}$ is the strength or the weight of the relationship shared between nodes and $W$ is the sum of all $w_{ij}$.

UCINET (Borgatti et al., 2002) is a statistical software package used to evaluate social networks and report a series of network and organizational values that create measures for each individual in the network. UCINET also has the capability to evaluate global measures of the network including density and homophily, the tendency for members to form close relationships with similar or like members.
The first hypothesis in this section (H2a) suggested that participants with high organizational commitment would demonstrate homophilic behavior in the social network. The Moran’s I results showed that OC demonstrate small but positive homophily across the network ($r=.25$, permutations=10,000, $p < .001$, $SE = .03$). The Geary’s C results also showed that OC demonstrate a modest positive homophily within the network ($r=.67$, permutations=10,000, $p < .001$, $SE = .05$). The second hypothesis (H2b) suggested that participants with high organizational engagement would demonstrate homophilic behavior in the social network. The Moran’s I results showed that OE demonstrate small positive homophily across the network ($r=.28$, permutations=10,000, $p < .001$, $SE = .03$) and the Geary’s C results again showed that OE demonstrated modest positive homophily within the network ($r=.68$, permutations=10,000, $p < .001$, $SE = .05$).

The final hypothesis in this section (H2c) suggested that participants with high self-reported leader emergent behavior would not demonstrate homophily in the social network. Leaders require relationships with their followers so it makes sense that leaders would socially distance themselves from each other across the network. The Moran’s I results showed that self-reported leader emergent behavior demonstrated a small positive homophily across the network ($r=.30$, permutations=10,000, $p < .001$, $SE = .03$). The Geary’s C results also show that self-reported emergent leadership behavior demonstrate slightly positive to no homophilic tendencies within the network ($r=.87$, permutations=10,000, $p < .001$, $SE = .05$).
Tests of the Hypotheses H3a, H3b, and H3c

H3a: Organizational members with high density ego networks will demonstrate a positive relationship with peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the higher ego networks density the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

H3b: Organizational members with high degree will demonstrate a positive relationship with peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the higher degree the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

H3c: Organizational members with strong eigenvector centrality measures will demonstrate a stronger peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the stronger eigenvector centrality measures the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

Centrality Measures

Centrality measures are a family of measurements that are reflective of a node’s relational position in a network. These measurements indicate the node’s contribution and structural importance to the network. Centrality measures often represent social advantages that a node possesses by virtue of their position in the network (Borgatti et al., 2013; Borgatti & Foster, 2003; Brass & Krackhardt, 1999). From a sociological perspective centrality can represent a node’s prominence, ability to influence, leaders, involvement, prestige, and power (Kramer & Crespy, 2011). Centrality in non-negative relationships, such as friendship or trust centrality, is considered a positive measurement indicating influence and social capital, which gives an individual node or person opportunity and advantages that may not be available to other nodes in the network (Borgatti et al., 2013; J. M. Smith et al., 2014). Two particular centrality measures used in this study are degree centrality and eigenvector centrality.
**Degree Centrality.** The simplest measure of a node’s centrality is degree centrality, which is simply the number of relationships a particular node has with other nodes in the network. Degree centrality is representative of the distribution of leadership influence throughout a network, the more relationships a leader has, the more people they can potentially inspire, and influence in their organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). Degree centrality $d_i$ of actor $i$ is simply the summation of all adjacent nodes or people in the organization’s network. $x_{ij}$ is the value of the relationship composite, or presence of a tie from the $i$th person (row in the matrix) to the $j$th person (column in the matrix). $d_i = \sum_j x_{ij}$, where degree centrality can be further broken down into indegree, those people that look to a leader to lead, and outdegree, which could represent the people a leader goes to influence and make changes in the organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006).

**Eigenvector Centrality.** Eigenvector centrality is similar to degree centrality in which you count the number of nodes adjacent to a given node like degree centrality accept you also weight each neighboring node by its centrality score, where $e_i$ is the eigenvector centrality score for the $i$th person $e_j$ is the eigenvector centrality score for the $j$th person (adjacent to the $i$th person), $\lambda$ (lamda) is a proportionality constant called the eigenvalue, $x_{ij}$ is the value of the relationship composite from the $i$th person (row in the matrix) in the matrix to the $j$th person (column in the matrix). The equation is an adaptation where each node’s centrality is proportional to the sum of the centralities of the nodes it is adjacent. $e_i = \lambda \sum_j x_{ij} e_j$, where eigenvector values are often interpreted in social network analysis as a measure of popularity in the sense that a person with the highest eigenvector centrality is connected to people that are themselves well connected.
This compensates for a person that has fewer connections but could still have a higher score than a person with more connections if the first person is connected to very popular people while the second person’s friends are not as popular (Bonacich & Lloyd, 2015).

**Density Measures**

Network density, $G_d$, is the number of ties in a network or sub network, like an ego network, in proportion to the total possible number of ties (Wasserman & Faust, 1994). $G_d = \frac{T}{n*(n-1)}$, where $T$ represents the total number of ties or relationships in the network and $n$ denotes the total number of people in the network. $n * (n - 1)$ is the total possible number of ties in a network assuming a person cannot be in a relationship with him or herself. Ego networks are sub network centered on one particular node and the immediate adjacent ties so that an ego networks density can be a measure of an individual node’s connectedness of his or her personal relationships within the organization. $G_d$ measures the amount of overall connectedness of a group and an indicator of shared network trust and influence among the group members. Pearson’s product-moment correlations were used to test hypotheses of how a participant’s social network density, degree centrality and eigenvector centrality related to the outcome of peer-reported leader emergences behavior.

The first hypothesis (H3a) predicted ego network density would have a positive relationship with peer-reported emergent leadership behavior. The results show that network density does not have a positive relationship but a slightly negative correlation with PRLEB ($r = -.21$, df=112, $p < .05$). The second hypothesis (H3b) predicted degree centrality would have a positive relationship with peer-reported emergent leadership behavior. The results show that degree centrality does have a positive relationship with
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PRLEB \((r=.26, \text{df}=113, p < .01)\). The final hypothesis predicted a higher eigenvector centrality measure within a social network would correlate with high PRLEB. A stronger but modest positive correlation was found between PRLEB and eigenvector measures \((r=.34, \text{df}=113, p < .001)\). The following table provides additional variable correlation measures (see Table 4.12).

Table 4.12

*Summary of Pearson’s product-moment correlations for social network analysis variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-RLEB</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer-RLEB</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eigenvector Centrality</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Degree Centrality</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ego Density</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p < .05\)

**Network structure**

After examining network measure, I used two algorithms to reveal the network structure of the church. The first algorithm was a core/periphery analysis that creates a partition of people in the network into two groups, the core and the periphery, by examining the density of connections among the members of the organization (Borgatti & Everett, 2000). This algorithm is built on the assumption that people in the core of the organization will be well connected to other people within the core. UCINET looks for well-connected people occupying a similar social space in the network then separates
them from the larger group and reestablishes network measures. The process is repeated until the most highly connected people occupying the most prominent social space is identified and deemed the core (Borgatti et al., 2002). The core/periphery analysis only separates people into two groups.

The second algorithm was used to identify factions in the social network of the church. The faction algorithm identifies subgroups in the network by examining organizational members that share similar social space and cutting the weakest tie in the network then reexamining organizational members that share similar social space and looks for groups that have separated from the major social component of the network (Borgatti et al., 2002; Panning, 1982). This process is repeated over and over until strongly connected groups or factions are revealed in the network as the continuing process of eliminating the weakest relationship from the network. The results of both algorithms can be seen in the following sociogram (see Figure 4.4).
Both algorithms identified the same “core-faction,” located in the central part of the network in Figure 4.4. A total of seven factions were identified and several members of the church did not belong to any faction. Social space is over-emphasized in Figure 4.4 to help clearly distinguish between factions.

Additional Findings

Along with the primary investigation procedure a couple interesting findings were discovered and may warrant further investigation. The demographic data collected allowed for additional breakdown of generational views of leadership and not every age category viewed organizational commitment and engagement the same. The midrange
adults, between 45 of 64, valued engagement particularly dedication in both peer and self-reported leadership. While the younger adults, under 44 years of age, valued absorption from the engagement scale and continuance from the commitment scale when identifying leaders. Senior adults, over the age of 65, showed a stronger negative relationship with the affective scale from the commitment instrument indicating how a person feels about the organization could have a negative value when identifying leaders. All of this taken together creates an opportunity to examine the differences in the leadership expectation between generations. Explanations of traditional models of leadership may not be as effective in describing leadership in younger generations than the theories have with older generations.

The network correlations show a connection between peer-reported and self-reported leadership behavior, which is expected but the strength of the correlation was smaller than expected. This finding could be examined more closely to look at the role self-efficacy plays in people emerging as leaders in the church.

Finally, ego density has a negative correlation with both types of leadership identification while degree centrality has positive correlations. This creates an interesting dynamic; leaders may want to develop as many connections in the organization as possible and simultaneously reduce as many connections between friends as possible because connection between friends work against members being recognized as a leader.

A strong core-periphery organization dominates the structure of the social network. Leadership is more strongly identified through self and peer-reported behaviors within the core. It would be interesting to examine how a person could move from the periphery to the core or examine how members respond to leadership and how leadership
is identified in the periphery. Also each faction identified a leader by peer-reported leadership emergent behavior, but each faction did not necessarily identify a leader through self-reported leadership emergent behavior indicating that some people may be perceived as fulfilling the role of group leader while not personally identifying her or himself as a leader.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has reviewed the quantitative findings of this study. These findings revealed some surprising patterns. First, organizational commitment showed a much smaller correlation with self-reported emergent leadership behavior than was expected and organizational commitment had a small effect on the variation when combined with organizational engagement. However, organizational engagement had a much stronger correlation with self-reported leader emergent behavior and played a stronger role in explaining variance when combined with organizational commitment particularly the subscale absorption.

The social network analysis revealed the social network is built on relationships reflecting church members that: intentionally go out of their way to connect with one another; member that are available to one another when help is needed; members that trust one another; members that share activities outside the organization; members that are personal friends, and members that serve the organization together. Moran I and Geary C tests showed organizational commitment and organizational engagement demonstrated slight global homophilic tendencies in the organizational relationships. So, friends in the organization share similar attitudes about commitment and engagement and tend to group together but not in any specific area of the social network.
The same Moran I and Geary C tests were run on self-reported emergent leadership behavior. The results showed that self-reported leaders do not have a tendency to form or maintain friendships with similar self-reporting leaders. However self-reported leader emergent behavior does display homophily across the network indicating self-reported leadership behavior happens in specific regions of the social network, specifically the core of the network.

Degree centrality or the amount of social connections a person has in the network had a positive relationship with peer-reported leadership but ego network density that measures how connected those social connections are to each other had a negative correlation with peer-reported leader emergent behavior. Eigenvector centrality of geodesic distances had a positive correlation with peer-identified leadership. These results indicate that followers who are recognized as an emerging leader most likely have a large number of relationships in the organizational network. But the eigenvector centrality correlation also indicates that followers that emerge as peer identified leaders know and gravitate toward the most influential people in the network.

The following chapter will report the results of the third phase of this study, the emergent leadership narratives, for the local church. Chapter Six will interpret the results found in this analysis by combining both the quantitative and qualitative data together. The interpretation will be discussed and conclusions drawn from the data to complete this study.
CHAPTER FIVE
QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter focuses primarily on the third phase of this complementary mixed methods study which uses a three-phase convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data (Creswell, 2015). The study has been divided into three phases to simplify the data collection procedures and to keep the complexity of the various components of the current study contained in separate sections for easy reporting. The first two phases involved an initial set of interviews and organizational survey. The initial interviews established the ideas, beliefs and behaviors expected from organizational members that create the foundation for the shared social relationships in the organization. The second phase was a survey to measure organizational commitment, organizational engagement, leader emergent behavior as well as social connections between the organizational members. The results of the first and second phase were covered in Chapter Four.

This third phase focuses on the emergent leadership experiences and narratives as perceived by organizational members. The intent of this phase was to learn about the organizational environment and how people emerge as leaders within the church or even how they are discouraged from becoming leaders. Since the primary focus of this study is leader emergence behavior (and I believe leadership is a social and relational process), surveys can only explore a few variables or antecedents that might lead to emergent leadership. A mixed method strategy allows for the personal stories and experiences behind the statistical numbers to ascertain a fuller understanding of the leader emergent behavior within the church. By conducting this research, I hoped to gain an improved
understanding of how informal leadership develops or is restricted within this organization.

Through qualitative interviews with organizational members, I gathered information about participants’ experiences as emerging leaders in the church. I also asked them to share stories and observations of how they have seen other leaders emerge in the church. Finally, participants were asked to share experiences about how the organization failed in allowing people to grow as a leader, or prevented people from becoming a leader in the church.

This study has provided feedback on the overall environment of leader emergence in the church and aided in identifying the organization’s strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness as it promotes or hinders the development of informal emergent leaders. Data gathered in this study hopefully will help the formal leaders of this church adjust the leadership development processes in the future and allow for the continuous improvement of leaders which in turn has the potential to affect the church’s desire and ability to impact their local community for the greater good.

**Member Interviews**

An organizational leader consent process was initiated before this study began, by asking the pastor of the church to review and approve the interview protocol. After the survey was completed from phase two, a participant interview list was established by eigenvector centrality measures from the social network analysis covered in Chapter Four and approved by the leader of the church. Participants were invited in order of their eigenvector centrality, starting with the organizational members with the strongest
centrality scores. I individually contacted and requested their participation in the interview process and scheduled a time and place for each individual interview.

Before each interview could take place, a consent form approved by the University of Central Arkansas Institutional Review Board was reviewed with the participant. Once the participant agreed to be part of the study, I collected a signed consent form and left a blank consent form with the participant along with my university email, my dissertation committee chair’s university email, and contact information for the Institutional Review Board. I also took time to inform participants at the beginning of their interview that they could decide to stop their participation in the interview at any time.

Each interview took approximately 60 minutes and was conducted face-to-face at public locations such as a local coffee shop, public library, and local restaurants. Interviews were recorded and transcribed in order to analyze themes that encourage or discourage leader emergence behavior in the community of faith for this study. All interviews were recorded using a digital recorder and stored in a password protected files on my computer.

Organizational members’ personal identifiers were removed to protect the participants’ confidentiality through the study. A total of nine female and five males agreed to be interviewed. No further personal descriptors except gender and age category are supplied in the study since confidentiality was promised during the research project. Transcriptions and raw survey data for this study will be kept for no longer than three years in the LEAD office (Mashburn Hall Room 235) at the University of Central Arkansas as agreed upon to conduct this research in the IRB application (IRB# 14-194).
The administrators of the LEAD program at the University of Central Arkansas will destroy all data after three years.

The goal of this study is not to generalize to a population but to obtain insight into emergent leadership experiences and emergent leadership behavior in the church. I decided to select individuals that could help me maximize my understanding of emergent leadership activities in this particular community of faith. Therefore, I decided on a purposeful sampling technique using highly connected people within the community (Creswell, 2012; Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007). These highly connected people have a stronger probability of experiencing and witnessing emergent leadership behavior with the church that makes these participants potentially rich with information pertaining to emergent leadership knowledge in the church. I calculated eigenvector centrality for each participant during the second phase of this study. Eigenvector centrality is a statistical measure of how highly connected a person is in the organization based on number of highly connected people they know in the network. So I used the purposeful sampling scheme representing both a criterion and opportunistic approach based on eigenvector centrality to invite participants to share with me their leadership experiences in the church (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007). I hoped to draw from enough shared experiences through this sampling technique so that the sampling method would greatly increase the likelihood of generating findings that are both detailed in content and representative of the shared experiences in the church.

After selecting the criteria for the interview sample, the next decision was to determine the number of people to represent a good sample of the organization to conduct the interviews. No specific or absolute number of interviews guarantees qualitative data
collection saturation, but several minimum participant guidelines based on research design or method can help guide researchers when selecting sample size or the number of interviews that should be conducted. This study is focused on one community of faith and could be considered by some as a case study. Creswell (2012) recommends no less than three to five participants when planning to design a research plan to do an in-depth exploration of a bounded system, like a church. But I am not solely looking at the church, general activities, or the events of the people in the church. I am looking at leader emergent behavior particularly through the social structure in the organization which is similar to a phenomenological study requiring less than or equal to ten participants (Creswell, 2013).

My primary concern was engaging enough people through interviews to ensure a good representation of leadership experiences in the church and making sure those experiences are legitimate findings both trustworthy and confirmable. I used Creswell’s recommendation between five and ten participants based on his guidelines for case and phenomenological studies, so I initially invited only eight people to participate in the interpretive set of interviews. After finishing, transcribing, coding, and analyzing those eight interviews, I recognized some undeveloped topics and patterns present in the data that were not comprehensive enough to draw any conclusions. I decided to invite another six people to participate in the interpretive interviews based on the participants’ centrality measures similar to the selection criteria used for the original eight participants in the interview. I transcribed, coded, and analyzed enough data where I felt comfortable that the conclusions I was finding were accurate and representative of leader emergent behavior in the community of faith.
Participants

So, based upon eigenvector centrality measures from phase two, twenty members were identified to possibly participate in the semi-structured interviews. Initially eight interviews were scheduled but I determined the study required an additional six interviews. Those six interviews were added to ensure data collection saturation. The final or remaining six potential interviewees were kept as backups in case there was difficulty in scheduling interviews. Three members chose not to be interviewed and one could not be interviewed because of scheduling conflicts. Four of the six backups were used with two still in reserve for any other unforeseen problems. Interviews took place between the months of March 2015 and April 2015. The following table represents the centrality measures, general demographics, and the amount of years the participants has spent with the church (see Table 5.1).
Table 5.1

Summary of Church Members Participating in the Interpretive Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Eigenvector Centrality Value</th>
<th>Age Demographic</th>
<th>Church Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretive interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded to identify successful and unsuccessful emergent leadership behavior in the organization’s history. These interviews were analyzed using an evaluation coding technique (Saldaña, 2013; D. R. Thomas, 2006). The technique uses non-quantitative codes that assign judgment about merit and worth and significance of leadership activity in social network structure.
Evaluation coding has been used in policy, action, organizational and evaluation studies (Patton, 2014; Saldaña, 2013).

**Evaluative Coding**

The evaluation coding technique used a related approach to the values coding method used in the initial set of interviews from phase one. Participants’ statements are categorized into topics and subtopics based on statements reflecting a participant’s personal value, attitude, or belief about leadership and leadership experiences in the local church (See Table 5.2).

Table 5.2

*Example of Topic and Subtopic Coding Markers Developed in the Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote Reference</th>
<th>Broad Category</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Participant Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Self-Sacrificing</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared experience</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Shared experience</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Betrayal</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>Leader Trait</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>Leader Trait</td>
<td>Prototype</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Cares</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation coding adds an additional level of analysis by assessing the magnitude of the participant’s reflections. This additional label indicates the participant’s reflections as a positive or negative value or experience, which allow for quick sorting of both positive and negative experience among the same topics. This is very useful when
combining 14 participants’ experiences on emergent leadership behavior. For example, two participants may share a similar experience but interpret the magnitude of the same experience differently. A positive experience for one person maybe a negative experience for another.

Statements that reflect participants’ recommendation or their ideas of general organizational improvements are labeled separately. This category is very valuable because it not only represents and reflects the participant’s experiences but also his or her critical and analytical evaluations of specific personnel, events, and leadership experiences within the organization. The recommendations not only take into account the participant’s own reflection but also allow them to partner with me as the researcher in identifying the collective understanding of leadership. Four distinct processes are used to make sense of the collected data: analysis of patterns, interpretation of significance, judgment of results, and recommendations (D. R. Thomas, 2006). My goal in performing evaluation coding is to determine what is allowing leaders to emerge and what is preventing people from emerging as leaders from the participants’ perspective (Merriam, 2014). After this study is complete recommendations from participants will be collected from the interviews and all personal identifiers will be removed and given to the formal leaders of the church to assist them in leadership development.

**Scholarship Shaping the Interview Protocol**

The development of the interpretive interview protocol is directly tied to the current scholarship of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), organizational engagement (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007), social network analysis techniques (Borgatti et al., 2013; Wasserman & Faust, 1994), and qualitative interviewing practices (Merriam,
The interview questions used in this study were developed from previous organizational research and theoretical frames, which kept the interview focused on behaviors and attitudes of group members that have emerged from the organization as informal leaders or the group practices that restrict members from practicing emerging leadership behavior. These theories and previous research assist in interpretation of the responses given by participants during the interviews.

The interview protocol was structured around several focal questions designed to cover the main aspects of my third research question concerning the leadership narrative of the organization. My questions were designed to draw out an individual’s experiences and understanding about leadership in the church. I concentrated on specific leadership experiences rather than general topics of leadership to generate unambiguous, informative responses from participants. Participants were asked, “Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?” This question was an attempt to open the interview with an easy question so that the interviewee could answer confidently and without much emotional or mental stress (Patton, 2001; Turner, 2010). Also, the question allowed participants to identify specific events and people that initially shaped the social connections the participant developed within the organization.

The second question I asked in the interview was, “Could you list for me some of the people you are closest to in this organization?” I followed up with the next question, “From the people you listed, who would you say are leaders in the organization?” The second and third questions in the interview are used to generate a list to compare connectedness of church members to social network map created by the survey. These question serves as a validity and reliability check for the social network
accuracy created by the survey in phase-two (Borgatti et al., 2013). Every interviewee that gave an account of a leadership experience or witnessed leadership behavior was socially connected to the church member mentioned in the interpretation interview. This eliminated “hear-say” stories and ensured the stories and experiences were witnessed accounts of leadership activities creating confidence in the shared accounts of the interviewees within the church.

The question, “How do those you have listed stand out from other organizational members?” is used to identify specific emergent leader traits and behaviors that are expected from the role of followers emerging as leaders as well as the social construct of the relationship formed between the interviewee and his or her peers that demonstrate leader emergent behavior. This places the interviewee experiences and accounts in Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) interpretive framework of followership theory creating a lens to review and interpret the activities of followers.

I followed up by asking the question, “Can you share with me some activities or behaviors each person you have identified has done to establish him or her as a leader?” This question was designed to draw out long-term behaviors and characteristics of followers as emergent leaders. This question and follow-up questions revolved around Meyer and Allen’s (1991) understanding of organizational commitment that reflects a person’s attitudinal commitment based on how people think about their relationship with their church or organization. This question allows me to explore the expected depth of the emotional and psychological bond of commitment people see in emergent leaders. Participants shared the behaviors and interpreted the mindset of their peers, which indicates if their peers’ values and goals are congruent with those of the organization.
When participants in this study shared about the commitment of emergent leaders they described the importance of personal responsibility for the organization’s well-being. This interpretation of commitment is slightly different than the traditional Meyer et al. (1993) definition of organizational commitment.

This question also allows organizational members to describe the behaviors of members that are representing the expected organizational engagement, the psychological presence of an organizational member involved in organizational tasks (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Many interviewees shared stories of their peers that emerged as leaders through dedication to church maintenance tasks and being fully engaged in community activities of service to people inside the church. Witnessed accounts gave many examples of engaged church members that had a strong sense of energetic and effective connection to church activities and service opportunities to others in the church. These stories matched the definition of organizational engagement described by Schaufeli et al. (2006).

The interview question, “Can you share with me some activities or behaviors each person you have identified has done to establish him or her as a leader?” also brought out witnessed accounts and experiences where followers in the organization were not socially allowed to emerge as a leader. The reasoning revealed a failure for organizational members to not be in line with values and goals of the organization. This ties to the understanding of prototypicality or an expectation of how an emergent leader aligns with the shared mental construct of the group that establishes the expected characteristics of leaders as they represent the group’s values and norms (Haslam, 2001). Prototypicality
plays a large role in determining how followers conclude if they will follow an emergent leader or not.

The final question, “Is there anything you would like to share with me about any of the people you identified in the organization?” is a recognition that participants may come with preconceived ideas about what the interview will be like. So, this question allowed interviewees to share with me what they wanted or expected to share in the interview.

**Themes**

Interviews were coded for personal beliefs, values, and attitudes then categorized by subjects, topics, and subtopics with a positive or negative magnitude based on narrative descriptions of leadership (Patton, 2014). I sorted leadership events into broad chronological categories in ten-year increments stretching over the past 50 years to identify reoccurring patterns and the larger story of the organization. The qualitative data were also sorted by the stories that were common between participant’s interviews identifying common people, events, problems, actions, and outcomes, but I also paid particular attention and identified times when the stories changed or was different from one participant to another (Creswell, 2013).

I looked for information that contributed to a better understanding of how organizational members emerge as informal leaders; this included organizational member experiences, stories, and observations (Merriam, 2014; Patton, 2014). Subjects and topics shared by participants were initially grouped together to identify 28 subjects, 42 different themes, and 147 different codes. Similar themes were combined and regrouped, and subjects and topics were once again sorted and checked for continuity. Eight final themes
where identified in the shared narrative of the participants that directly influence leader emergence behavior.

Along with information collected in the survey, these findings from participant narratives indicate the overall environment and expectations of leadership development as well as hindrance of emerging leaders. Thematic information about informal leadership experiences was the primary goal of the third phase of this research project. The identification of common themes is a key step in analyzing expressions, concerns, assumptions, failures and success, each offering insight to the organizational culture that develops or hinders emergent leadership behavior (Merriam, 2014). Some of the themes identified in the study are as follows: broad understanding of leadership and service, relationships, engagement, commitment, prototype, training and equipping, encouraging leadership, discouraging leadership, and mentorship.

**Broad understanding of leadership and service.** Defining exactly what leadership is and how it operates in any organization is notoriously difficult to articulate. When five of the participants in this study described their understanding of leadership, they reported a very broad definition of leadership. Four of the five participants had such a broad understanding of leadership that they understood leadership to be any contribution of service to the well-being of the organization. This ties back to the bigger issue of scholars having difficulty defining leadership (Burns, 1978; Ciulla, 2003; Rost, 1991). One participant remarked, “I would redefine leadership. Leadership is any contribution you make to a church” (Participant 008). And others reported, “When you decorate for all the weddings, that’s a leadership role” (Participant 056), and “So if there's somebody that loves to cook, you could say, that's a leadership position”
(Participant 023). So for many of the participants finding a person’s potential place to make a contribution or serve the community is leadership. One of the participants summed up the service focused idea of leadership by pointing out that people assume service to the church is leadership because leadership has not truly been modeled and defined. “Maybe they were raised in the church and don’t have that [understanding.] They don’t really realize what a leadership role looks like so they focus on doing and serving instead of leading” (Participant 095). But throughout the interviews there was a strong connection of expectation to serve the church and being a leader. Some leadership theories strongly tie service and leadership together such as servant leadership theory (Greenleaf, 2002) but Greenleaf suggests that service is a means to leadership but not necessarily synonymous with leadership.

Some participants reflected on the lack of leadership training events at the church as a reason why there is not a common understanding for leadership. Two participants make this point: “I don’t know of any leadership classes that have happened recently although we have undergone a lot of change over the last year” (Participant 121), and “I think a lot of time in the business world leaders are molded over a period of years, but in the church, it’s almost like, ‘Okay, you're a leader.’ And now you're looking around, going, ‘what does this mean?’” (Participant 095). This lack of training events could account for the deficit of a shared definition and expectation of leaders and leadership. Again, most definitions of leadership emphasize the act of influence leaders have on others and using that influence to move the group towards a goal or greater good (Northouse, 2010), but in the interviews definitions of leadership emphasized service to the community and not the act of influence.
All fourteen church members did draw strong connections between serving the larger community and leading in the community. They all expected a serving attitude from emerging leaders. “She comes from such a servant’s position that they may not really think of her as kind of natural [pause] leader. But, I would say she’s definitely a leader” (Participant 127). Another member described service to the community is expected among emerging leaders. He commented, “I want leaders to serve and be transparent and be open” (Participant 029), and “she serves and volunteers. So yeah, I would say she is a leader” (Participant 056). I found that not just serving but having a servant attitude in leaders was also important for participants. One member pointed out that emerging leaders have “a servant heart and they're not complainers” (Participant 127). Also another said, “That’s really what leadership to me is all about like helping people along, encouraging them along the way, not being at the end or in the corner office or wherever” (Participant 121).

Taking personal ownership was also an important expectation for emerging leaders in the church. Ten of the participants expressed the importance of personal ownership. One commented, “I would say that she’s definitely has strong leadership [ability] because she takes it on herself. She’s so passionate about that” (Participant 008). Emergent leaders are expected to look beyond their own needs to the needs of others. “They do go above and beyond to serve others, and do what they can when they see a need” (Participant 011). One participant expressed guiding emerging leaders to take on personal responsibility for small everyday jobs then leading them into taking on larger roles. He remarked, “Leaders like that could start in very small things but there they begin to feel ownership. We have one man and his leader role is an usher but his job is to
lock up the church after Sunday's are over. He goes to every building and checks all the doors every Sunday, and it gives him a sense of ownership. He would never be able to lead in many other areas in the church” (Participant 127).

Some of the participants also suggested that unifying the organization’s understanding of leadership and expectations would help leaders emerge and take on responsibilities in the church. “We need to create a leadership class to help foster leadership abilities and discipleship expectations” (Participant 121). Another participant said, “The church should develop a communal understanding and responsibility of leaders and leadership” (Participant 047). Other participants saw a class or seminar as a great way for leaders to support one another. One participant added, “It would create opportunities for leaders and potential leaders to be social and share experiences and encourage each other” (Participant 029).

By not having a clear understanding of what is a leader is or what a leader does may create confusion in the expectation of emerging leaders. Ownership and being a servant are great qualities for leaders to have, but those qualities in themselves do not make someone a leader. Leadership is a dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals not just meeting a need in the organization (Conger & Pearce, 2003). Few participants mentioned the process of influence when talking about leadership in the church.

**Relationships.** Social connections are the conduits by which leadership takes place (Mehra, Smith, Dixon, & Robertson, 2006). Every participant talked about the importance of developing and maintaining relationships to have influence and to be effective when leading in the church. One participant commented, “Well, I mean, it's
going to be complicated. It's going to be interesting. But I don't feel like we're ever going to have any really strong leaders unless they're really strongly connected to at least a few people outside of their family circles in church” (Participant 029). When asked about how would you respond to a new or emerging leader in the organization, many participants talked about the importance of knowing the potential leader. Relationships are a starting point for new and emerging leaders. “Well, I think I would have to know a little bit about [the new leader]. I'd have to know them in a personal way, I think, to trust them as leaders” (Participant 127). One participant felt very strongly that leaders are not emerging because there are no processes or activities in place to help develop people connect and form deep relationships from where emerging leadership can occur. “You’ve got to be able to develop systems to make sure that these [relationships form], to make sure that people get plugged in. More than just on the superficial level [pause] that people feel not just accepted, but connected” (Participant 011).

Forming relationships is only part of the process for leaders to emerge; preexisting relationships can also be an obstacle for emerging leaders to step up to lead. One participant felt that church families that have been members for multiple generations kept leaders from emerging. “So there is an issue we got to take the favoritism out. You take the [name] family out. You take all those things away, and give everybody a kind of leveled playing field. It would make newcomers feel like, ‘Hey, there, everybody is on the same page. Let's see what where I can be involved’” (Participant 047). Another participant made a similar observation. “I think because the strong family circles and bonds within the church [pause] it can leave someone like my family who's not blood kin to anyone here [pause] can kind of leave us with a feeling of where do I fit? So, I think,
when you are attending the church you already have the 'where do I fit in' question to begin with, and then that makes me not want to be a leader here” (Participant 029). Some form of relationships are necessary for leadership to work in any organization and strong family relationships can be a major obstacle for new members if families are not open to forming new friendships.

The sociogram in Figure 4.4 shows the core and periphery structure of the church network. Each of the multigenerational families is strongly represented in the core. Some of the families have three or four family members in the core structure of the church network. This creates difficulty for new members of the community to occupy a social space where they can be identified as a leader. However, though multigenerational families in the church occupy strong positions in the core, many of the members of the families also occupy network positions of much less social influence in the periphery. Some multigenerational family members are represented as an individual outside of all the seven factions.

One participant recommended, “reducing the family and social hierarchy in the church” (Participant 008). Another member suggested the church could “develop a system to help people to connect with each other and give them the opportunity to lead with particular family members” (Participant 077). A member of one of the multigenerational families felt like it was not entirely the multigenerational families’ fault. “I think it's other people’s fault too because they don't stay long enough for us to get to know them. You can't get a deep friendship [she pauses] I can't give you what I have in a 10-minute conversation after church. You've got to be faithful to get the rewards I guess” (Participant 008). All fourteen participants agreed no easy solution
exists to deal with the informal social hierarchy in the church; it is part of the social system. Relationships in the church both encourage leaders to emerge, but they can also be a deterrent (Mehra et al., 1998). A church relationship development processes will need to be put in place to assist people in connecting to one another and connect new people to the preexisting family social structure for leaders to emerge in the community of faith.

Engagement. Emergent leaders in the church were also identified in the interviews by how they engage with other people, activities, and ministries. Eleven of the participants saw engagement as one of the initial ways leaders begin to separate themselves from non-leaders in the church. “We could learn a lot [about people] when pastor left. That’s when you learn what you can do, when you have to step it up and what you need to do, and we saw a lot of people stepping up that we had never seen before, you know” (Participant 047). Another person talked about watching others step up into leadership roles; “I remember when I [started] being impressed with [her], not standing back and waiting for somebody to say something, she just jumped in” (Participant 023). Another participant made similar remarks of the same person, “I mean I saw her you know that she’s getting involved. She wanted to pray for my kids, pray for my grandkids” (Participant 056). One participant described how quickly leaders emerge when they actively engaged in the church. “There is a new family in our church, and they have stepped up to leadership. I don't think they've even gone here a year. He's now our Sunday School teacher, and I'm very impressed by the way they’re following the Lord and leading in the church” (Participant 086).
Some participants remarked that deciding to engage and how to engage seemed to be primarily an internal struggle. “I think that once you decide personally that this is something I’m going to do and just step out there and do it, you realized it’s not that hard and not that big of a deal. And really in a church setting, people aren’t going to be overly critical of anybody. And we’re all there for the same reason; we’re all there to learn” (Participant 121). One participant recognized that inviting people to engage could be a source of new leaders. “Something I really noticed about new people is they want a job a lot quicker than you'd ever dreamed. That makes them feel like they belong. They don't want to be the needy one that everybody is nurturing. They want to be part of things. And so the more leadership roles you can develop and hand them to them as they're ready” (Participant 008). It is clear that when members actively engage in tasks and service to the church they begin to be recognized as a person of trust that thinks about the greater good of the community (Seymour, Welch, Gregg, & Collett, 2014). The participants make a strong case for the importance of engagement in the emergent leadership process (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Shuck, Reio Jr, & Rocco, 2011; Vogelgesang, Leroy, & Avolio, 2013).

**Commitment.** Ten of the fourteen church members that participated in the interviews separated out the importance of commitment beyond engagement. One offered, “I could just add a personal thing and that is, you know. We're committed to this church, and we're getting excited about the potential for change and about the potential for it becoming a place that, I think, we all hope and that leaders do feel enabled and equipped” (Participant 056). For one member that saw living up to the commitments to the church was essential for leader identification. “So, it's like there has to be [pause] just
repeated notable commitments that they follow through with” (Participant 095). And another said, “I mean, they're not like overbearing or just totally outspoken or anything like that, that I think just the steady, kind of commitment, you know, those are the words that come to mind when I think of [leaders]” (Participant 016).

Just as commitment can identify a person as a leader, the lack of commitment has ruled people out. “The people that were supposed to be there didn’t show up. And so it’s like, ‘How nice would it be if you didn’t have to worry about people not showing to do their [job] that they're responsible for. They have said they're going to do it. Show up and do it” (Participant 015). Every interviewee agreed that commitment must be more than just being present. “You just got to be there. You got to show up for more things than just Sunday morning” (Participant 086).

Prototype. Most group members have some form of a cognitive abstraction to which they expect leaders to be compared. This abstraction is made up of a community and individual person’s ideal values, behaviors, and features expected of all group members. It is an ideal image to which individuals compare themselves and evaluate if a leader measures up to an expectation of being a group member (Hogg et al. 1995; Turner 1987). Before leadership is recognized in the church, participants expressed the importance of the potential leader measuring up to the group prototype. One reflected, “I have a real concern. I have difficult time about [leaders] and making sure that they are doctrinally correct” (Participant 127). The same participant remarked, “How do you make them leaders before you even know what they believe? How can they share with other people correctly if they don't even know yet what they believe in and why?” (Participant 127) So sharing the same communal beliefs and values is important, but
some participants commented about unfair expectations for emerging leaders, “And so you’ve got like old school [denominational name] that their actions are very still bound [to an image.] It seems like by, for lack of a better term, like legalism, you know, like rules and stuff and so seriously you know” (Participant 095). Other participants used common Christian imagery from the Bible to describe what emerging leaders should look like. “I guess, exemplifying the fruits of the Spirit. It’s probably a pretty good place to start a pretty good indicator” (Participant 138). There was even recognition that someone could be a leader outside the organization, but if they don’t share group membership, they could cause issues for the church later. “Sometimes you have somebody that just has great leadership ability. They may not be real grounded in the church, but that's still how their personality leads them and to be careful sometimes when that starts to happen…. We can be tempted to use them too soon” (Participant 121).

Each participant in the interviews expressed additional prototypical expectations for members of the church to be viewed or emerge as leaders. Multiple participants brought up and discussed the following prototypical expectations during the interviews. I am including a quick list of reoccurring expectations in the interview and providing sample quotes from participants for each expectation. Interviewees had an expectation for leaders to be a caring person. “People that care and plugged in see some things others don’t. They see a need and just kind of fill that need” (Participant 023). There was an expectation that leaders should have a high moral character. “The first thing you've got to do is live an admirable life” (Participant 127). The behaviors of an emerging leader should also reflect qualities and characteristics of Jesus (central model figure of the church). “We should be able to see some kind of Christ-like behavior to wanting to live
like Jesus, and actually live that way” (Participant 047). Dependability and consistency are expected from everyone who leads a ministry at the church. “You didn't have to wonder if they were going to be there. You didn't have to please them. They were there because it was the thing to do” (Participant 121). Leaders and the church are expected be sincere in their relationships with others in the church. “The sincerity that they have to me makes them just stand out amongst other people in our church” (Participant 016). Every member mentioned the importance of leaders being trustworthy in the church. “Well, like I said a while ago, people that have proven that they're trust-worthy” (Participant 015).

Prototyping can also work against people if they don’t measure up to the image of a leader that the organization collectively shares. One of the members observed, “Like there’s a lot of behaviors and actions that are sort of ‘[denominational]’, and you know, a lot of stuff that is in the [denominational guiding book] and everything else like that. At one point, I remember feeling like the [denomination] is really bordering on really legalistic behavior” (Participant 095). Unfortunately the image someone may have of one person can become an unintentional standard for everyone else. “She's really intimidating because she's got everything just so. And we've got this image of how we're supposed to be [pause], and then there's how we are and we aren’t her” (Participant 138).

**Training and equipping.** Thirteen of the fourteen interview participants were concerned of the lack of training and equipping of members to assist members in becoming or emerging as leaders and that lack of training keeps people from stepping up and leading. One member said, “How as a church do we encourage or promote leadership? Right. So, I think we're lacking in that” (Participant 095). Others connected
the lack of training as the reason why some leaders don’t emerge. “And I think when you feel ‘discipled’ and equipped, I think you may be more likely to feel like you can be a leader” (Participant 121). That same participant went on to say, “There’s going to have to be some very intentional growing of the leaders so that to make this church work” (Participant 121).

Most agreed that the church does not need to reinvent leadership classes just be more intentional about growing leaders. “I mean, I think you could turn to the secular world and look at all the aspects that, you know, are involved in leadership” (Participant 029). Several interviewees commented about how this is a well-known problem of underdeveloped leaders. “[Pastor] is aware of this. There’s going to have to be an intentional development of what the initial leadership at least to get this thing going” (Participant 011). Along with training events there should be some type of leadership assessments. “I think it could be just a general like here are some boxes. Let's see how many you can check off. And then let's see what needs to be worked on and let's work on that [pause]. What can we do to help you get on track for feeling equipped?” (Participant 029) Participants did not see training and equipping as always being formal classes but at least intentional planned opportunity to connect with other leaders. “We could just be around people that have those qualities that you’re looking for. It doesn’t necessarily have to be a class; I don’t know. It doesn’t need to be the ‘Dale Carnegie things for Christians’” (Participant 047).

Leaders are encouraged. Another major theme revealed through the interviews is how the community needs to encourage leaders to emerge and continue moving forward in leadership growth and development. “We've got to and, I guess, keep others
going. That we encourage people to keep going. You got to keep mentioning it” (Participant 011). Five of the participants talked directly about how people can limit themselves, but with a little encouragement they could take the next step to be a leader in the church. “Sometimes you just know somebody would excel and be a leader, but they don’t have the confidence to excel” (Participant 077).

A part of leadership is implementing change, which can cause organizational stress as well as personal stress on the leader (Decoster, Stouten, Camps, & Tripp, 2014). Some of the participants expressed the importance to encourage leaders during times of change. For example, one participant showed concern for the pastor as a leader, “I know he has some things down the road that [our pastor] wants to change, and all I pray is that we all are onboard and supportive for whatever God leads him to change” (Participant 008).

A couple of the participants talked about how important encouragement is for leaders at the beginning of sharing their ideas and vision. Idea sharing and vision casting are fundamental leader emergent behaviors (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Côté et al., 2010; S. Oh, 2012). “There is an undercurrent of ideas that come up that either they're nurtured or they are squashed, and to me that's where the key for church leadership lies and sometimes it takes a person with this feel for flow. Like I'm talking about to figure out how to throw out some ideas, implement some, refine them until they work” (Participant 016). One participant shared that if formal leaders are not aware and encouraging to church members with ideas, those church members may never feel like they can emerge to be leaders. “So there are these little things cropping up, but once in a while something surfaces, and a preacher has got to be so careful. That's like a little flame that you're
trying to fan out in the woods to get it going. And if you snatch that match away, you'll never know that could have been a burning bonfire” (Participant 121).

Some members discussed how encouragement has been personally important to them. “Well, I mean, when I stepped up to leadership, there was a handful of people who were supportive. So, for me, I think that kept me going” (Participant 015). Several interviewees mentioned the importance of public leader recognition as an act of encouragement. “Why don't we get together and share ideas and encourage each other and build each other up. Like [we can] have the nursery workers come and have [the nursery leader] there, and the people that are leaders. Let's give them a title and recognize them” (Participant 008). Another member suggested a celebration and banquet for leaders; “And have a meeting of everybody who plays a consistent role as a leader in some areas. Make them feel like somebody, you know. People love that” (Participant 047)!

Leaders are discouraged. Some participants have experienced or witnessed discouragement as leaders. Discouragement has a way of wearing on leaders and leading to burnout but discouragement can also be used intentionally or unintentionally for keeping people from emerging as leaders (Carlson, Ferguson, Hunter, & Whitten, 2012; Maslach et al., 2001; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009). Speaking about a formal leader in the church, one participant commented about how formal leaders do not even realize when they are discouraging; “He did have a way of squashing ideas, and I think we're still paying for that. People are afraid to step out” (Participant 121). Beyond pastors and formal leadership church members can also be the source of discouragement. “For instance in circles, we hear some negativity about the leaders and the direction of
the church, and I wish we could do something about that” (Participant 056). Some comments can be discouraging even when the comments are not about leading or leadership. “There are still some people that think the way you dress makes you a leader and will say things… even about our pastor… that just needs to stop” (Participant 015).

Also, discouragement can come from a lack of infrastructure in the community and lack of organizational support. “I don’t know that we intentionally discourage leadership. Maybe we don’t make it real easy for people to lead and continue leading” (Participant 077). How ministries are set up in a church organization can create a feeling that each ministry is in an independent silo, which creates a sense of isolation for church leaders. This concern was mentioned by six of the members that were interviewed. For example one of them commented, “I think sometimes potentially, we get in our little slot, and we don’t think outside our slot. You know, me personally, I’m more worried about what’s happening with the nursery, in the preschool age right now, and I don’t really know what’s going on in the youth group or if they are struggling” (Participant 121). A similar comment was made from another member, “I don’t know if they need help over there. I don’t know what their needs are as far as volunteers or anything like that” (Participant 047). Finally a couple of the members talked about how some people that take from others and do not contribute to the overall welfare of the community can be discouraging. “We are a church. We have to serve each other for [the church] to work. We can't just take, take, take all the time. We have to give, give, give at some point, or the people that give are going to have given all they can or led all they can and then they get discouraged because nobody else is stepping up” (Participant 086).
As each participant shared stories of leadership discouragement I collected names to identify each person that was discouraged in the past. Every person mentioned in a story of discouragement was positioned on the periphery of the social network of the church. Two belonged to smaller factions on the periphery and five were not identified in any faction becoming isolated in the social structure of the church. There seems to be a strong connection between discouragement and social isolation. This isolation could be caused when the discouraged leader social isolates him or herself from the community or there is a collective isolation imposed on the discouraged leader from the community of peers.

**Mentorship.** Participants expressed a desire for a more formal plan where leaders enter into a personal developmental relationship so leaders with more experience or more knowledge can help guide a less experienced or less knowledgeable leader in the church (Higgins & Kram, 2001; Weinberg & Locander, 2014). Seven of the interviewees believed a church mentorship program would help all levels of leaders’ growth and development in critical leadership skills and help others see themselves as leaders in the church (Lapierre, Naidoo, & Bonaccio, 2012). Some interviewees that emerged as church leaders in the past expressed their frustrations. “I try to find the way. Where do you go? Who do you talk to? And how is that nurtured? How are the decisions made that does not fit in the vision of the church? Is that something we do? Can we direct you in a little different way? Where is that vehicle now? We don't have that. There is little to no guidance from other leaders” (Participant 016). Another participant shared his or her experience. “I've stepped back from my leadership position. I just couldn't get around it. I really wished I had a mentor. I mean, I didn't care if it was man or woman or young girl
or older than me. It wasn't like I had a vision of who it would be even. And maybe it's personality thing for me too, but because it seemed hard to develop some deeper relationships, it didn't happen for me. I probably wouldn't have stepped back had I felt mentored” (Participant 029). Another church leader confirmed the lack of mentorship. “Well, I think mentorship is essential. If you want to train a leader, you got to take them on and mentor them, and that's not always done very well, or it hasn't been in the past” (Participant 121).

Another member noted that in their experience mentorship is necessary for people to emerge as a leader. “Honestly I think most people that are encouraged to become leaders happens best on a one-on-one that worked with me. How can we find the leaders? I think if members were more intentional about trying to spread their own leadership around a little bit, we would see a lot more leaders come up” (Participant 011). And a well-established leader in the church agreed. If he could help in leadership development, it would be through mentorship. “I would try to pick some of our younger generation work with them and help them step up and take leadership roles” (Participant 127).

Participants’ Perspectives

The interviews in this study provided greater detail and more depth to organizational leadership than the surveys. The interviews allow insight into how church members interpret and narrate the aspects of the leadership activities. After I coded several interviews, it was apparent that some of the theoretical frames that guided this research matched the participants’ leadership experiences in the church perfectly. Theoretical constructs like organizational engagement (Kahn, 1992) and social network
theories (Mehra et al., 2006) provided structure to interpret the reported leadership events. These theories gave me the opportunity to better understand the organizational culture of leadership in the community of faith when participants talked about the expectations and behaviors of emergent leaders. Protoypicality (D. van Knippenberg, 2011) was easily identified through the shared stories and expectations when interviewees talked about expected leader emergent behavior and how that behavior should lined up with the expected norms and attitudes of the organization. One of the more exciting findings in this study is the overlapping interplay between prototypicality (Haslam, 2001) and followership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) that gives members permission to emerge as a leader as long as emerging leaders represent the beliefs and norms of the group. The perspectives of the interviewees demonstrate how good followership and adhering to group norms work together to allow church members to take on roles as leaders by peer evaluation and ultimately the permission of their peers.

Not all of the participants’ perspectives lined up well with expected current scholarship and theoretical frames. The interviewees looked at organizational commitment from a responsibility and dependability viewpoint rather than the traditional Meyer et al. (1993) definition of organizational commitment as a psychological bond between organizational members and the organization. The expectation of responsibility and dependability speak to the idea of a communal trust and under the conditions of uncertainty and organizational complexity that requires mutual adjustment of organizational members, such as taking on the roles of leader or follower, members must be able to sustain effective coordinated action. This is only possible where mutual confidence or trust is present (McAllister, 1995). So, the participant perspective of
commitment seen as responsibility and dependability does reflect a type of organizational commitment but not the psychological bond I expected to see. McAllister (1995) theoretical construct of trust among organizational members may be a good starting point to determine the antecedents of organizational commitment or the participants’ perspective of organizational commitment.

**Summary**

Fourteen participants selected by degree centrality measures from the church were interviewed to assess the leadership narrative and organizational activities that encourage or discourage people in emerging as a leader within the church. A total of nine themes were coded based on fourteen 60-minute conversations with participants sharing their thoughts on a range of leadership topics, personal, and witnessed leadership experiences. These shared and general experiences revealed in the interviews create an understanding of leadership among the participants in the church. For most participants, leadership meant some kind of personal contribution to the community and not necessarily guidance or influence of other community members (Burns, 1978; Rost, 1991). This certainly accounts for the blurred understanding between most interviewees in serving the community and being a leader within the community.

The initial findings show that all interview participants agree that leadership development and maintenance is a key component for the church’s future success and survival. Relationships, commitment, and engagement are all themes where leaders can be identified among their peers as potential emerging leaders. When potential leaders were identified they were intentionally or unintentionally held to a prototypical standard that is expected for all community members before they are recognized or followed as
emerging leaders in the community. All participants agreed mentorship and training programs are needed to help develop leaders within the church. These training programs would greatly assist in leaders continuing to emerge within the organization. The participants also recognized the importance of encouraging leaders due to the difficult and stressful nature of leadership. This also means being aware of the discouragement that comes through other community members and the organizational infrastructure that isolates and frustrates leaders.

**Conclusion**

The following chapter will merge the qualitative and quantitative data for interpretation and implications for the community of faith to encourage leadership emergence. Limitations and recommendations will also be covered along with a summary of all the findings from this research project.
CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This study used a complementary convergent design with three phases. The data collected from the three phases, including both quantitative and qualitative data, are reviewed, merged, and discussed in this chapter. The convergence of data types allows both types of collected data to provide multiple insights and allows the ability to examine the research problem from multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2015).

The first phase conducted in this study was a small set of initial interviews to establish what behaviors and activities promote relationships in the organization. After I analyzed the first phase results, I created a survey to evaluate social relationships and measure organizational member engagement and commitment. The second phase of the study was the collection of survey data used to establish social network measures from all of the members’ relationships in the church. This survey also measured the associations between the dependent and independent variables of member engagement, commitment, and leader emergent behavior. The final phase was a more substantial set of interviews to determine the leadership narrative shared among members of the local congregation.

This chapter is divided into six sections to review and discuss the results of the quantitative and qualitative findings. The first section reviews and discusses the quantitative findings of the study and how those findings support this study’s hypotheses. The next section addresses the implications of these findings. The third section reviews the major themes revealed through the fourteen church member interviews that uncover the leadership narratives that directly impact the emergent leadership behavior in the community of faith. The fourth section looks at the themes and discusses social
processes, which help or hindered people emerging as leaders in the organization. The following section merges both the quantitative and qualitative findings to reveal a model used in the church to encourage or discourage people emerging from group member to informal group leader. The sixth section will review the limitations of this study, possible future directions based on the results, and implications for the leaders of the church in this study.

The overall focus of this study was to examine leader emergent behavior in the organizational members in a local church through the organizational engagement, organizational commitment, and social relationships of the followers in the church. The following questions were used to guide and shape the research methodology and hypotheses of the study.

1. How does a follower’s organizational commitment and organizational engagement influence the likelihood of assuming roles of informal leadership in the organization?

2. Does emerging leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and/or organizational engagement influence the development of the organization’s social network?

3. How do followers hinder or promote emergent leadership behavior in each other through their social context within the organization?

**Review of Theoretical Frames**

Followership theory is the predominant frame that is used as the foundation of this study. Specifically, followership theory focuses on the study of the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). In addition,
emergent leadership theory looks at how certain group members exert significant influence over other group members although no formal authority has been vested in them (Schneider & Goktepe, 1983). This emergent leadership behavior is the specific leadership and followership process being studied among the followers in this investigation. This study contributes to the large amount of evidence, accumulated over decades of research, which has consistently established that specific traits and behaviors focusing on coordinating team tasks (e.g. task analysis, planning, structuring, and goal setting) are particularly influential for organizational members to emerge as group leaders (Taggar et al., 1999).

The first part of this study uses followership theory to examine specific traits and behavior of followers within the organization. The presence or absence of organizational engagement (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007) and organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990) as viewed through followership theory assesses how these follower traits encourage leader emergence, which helps inform our understanding of the traits and behavior that lead to leadership emergence among followers.

But followership theory also creates a social construct to be observed beyond the follower’s role, the follower’s characteristics, following behaviors, or outcomes associated with the leadership process. It also takes into account a constructionist approach that involves consideration of the co-constructed relational nature of the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Social network theory contributes to this study because social network analysis techniques can account for how the relationships among organizational members and examine how these relationships impact leader emergence among followers within the organization (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006; Mehra et al., 2006).
This study looks at a follower’s position in the social network of the organization and examines how the follower’s position in the organizational network creates social influence and social capital. This examination of social position in the organization helps inform our understanding of leadership emergence of followers viewed through followership theory’s constructionist underpinnings. If leadership is a relational process then the follower-to-follower and follower-to-leader relationships are extremely important and should be taken into account when studying leadership (Rost, 1991).

The interview portion of this study informs the understanding of leadership emergence as viewed through followers in the organization. Followership theory continues to provide a means by which I can interpret the interviews and stay within the boundaries of the followership theory. Through the interviews, I heard participants determining that certain traits are expected from those followers that emerge as leaders from among their peers. The interviews allowed for the evaluation of the experiences or witnessed accounts of what activities have encouraged or discouraged attempts of followers emerging as leaders. This evaluative process helped establish what promotes or hinder informal leadership in the organization (Patton, 2014). All of the theoretical frames in this study: followership theory, emergent leadership theory, social network theory, and evaluative interview techniques, together help create a context to contribute to the developing ideas that contribute to emergent leadership behavior among followers in the organization.

**Review and Discussion of Quantitative Findings**

The research questions listed above lead to the following hypotheses that make up the quantitative portion of the study. The first set examines the relationships between
self-reported leader emergent behavior, organizational commitment, and organizational engagement.

\(H_1a\): Organizational commitment will have a positive relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior. That is, the higher the commitment to the organization, the higher the self-reported leader emergence behavior.

\(H_1b\): Organizational engagement will have a positive relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior. That is, the higher the engagement in the organization, the higher the self-reported leader emergence behavior.

\(H_1c\): Organizational commitment and organizational engagement will have a significant multivariate relationship with self-reported leader emergence behavior.

The second set of hypotheses examines the network relationships and the proximity between organizational committed and engaged members along with the proximity of self-reported emergent leader behavior.

\(H_2a\): Organizational members who display high measures in organization commitment will tend to be adjacent (or close) to one another in the organizational network. So, members with high organization commitment will demonstrate group homophily.

\(H_2b\): Organizational members who display high measures in organization engagement will tend to be adjacent (or close) to one another in the organizational network. So, members with high organization engagement will demonstrate group homophily.

\(H_2c\): Organizational members who display high measures in self-reported emergent leader identification will tend to be socially distant from one another in the organizational network. So, members with high self-reported emergent leader identification would not demonstrate group homophily.

The final set of hypotheses examines the correlations of social network measures – density, degree, eigenvector centrality and peer-reported emergent leader behavior.
**H3a:** Organizational members with high density will demonstrate a positive relationship with peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the higher density the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

**H3b:** Organizational members with high degree will demonstrate a positive relationship with peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the higher degree the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

**H3c:** Organizational members with strong eigenvector centrality measures will demonstrate a stronger peer-reported leader emergence behavior. So, the stronger eigenvector centrality measures the stronger the correlation with peer-reported leader emergence behavior.

**Organizational commitment.** The analysis conducted on the surveys showed a slight but significant correlation between the independent variable organizational commitment (OC) and the dependent variable self-reported emergent leadership behavior (SRLEB). OC was then broken down into the instrument’s sub-variables: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Both affective commitment and normative commitment displayed a small positive but significant correlation while continuance commitment showed a negative but statistically insignificant correlation. OC is based on an individual’s desire to continue organizational membership and is tied to group members’ emotional attachment to the organization, identification with the organization, and their involvement within the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This implies that the value of an organizational member’s commitment is derived from feelings or beliefs in what the organization stands for and is related to psychological and organizational factors (Withey & Cooper, 1989).

I expected to see a much stronger correlation between OC and SRLEB as in similar studies (Norman, Avey, Nimnicht, & Graber Pigeon, 2010; Rego, Vitória, Magalhães, & Ribeiro, 2013). As I mentioned earlier, the interview phase of the study
revealed that commitment is seen as responsibility and dependability not the psychological bond I expected to see. McAllister (1995) theoretical construct of trust may be a better starting point to determine the antecedents to the participants’ perspectives of organizational commitment. The results of these findings indicate that the Meyer and Allen definition of organizational commitment is not as important in leader emergent behavior as other traits. However, the church does value a particular type of organizational commitment based on trust and reliability. This type of commitment may have a greater correlation to leader emergent behavior. Previous studies looked at organizational commitment as a crucial factor, which mediates whether or not they will behave in terms of the expectations held by the group members (Ellemers, 2012). I inferred that people who felt committed to the organization would be more willing to exert themselves in order to achieve shared goals even if they are expected to emerge as leaders for the greater good of the group, but the results showed a smaller correlation than expected.

**Organizational engagement.** When examining the correlation between organizational engagement (OE) and self-reported emergent leadership behavior (SRLEB), I found a strong positive and significant relationship. OE was expanded into the engagement sub-variables vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor and dedication showed a significant medium correlation while absorption showed a strong significant correlation with self-reported emergent leadership behavior. This finding is in line with the current theories developed by followership scholars. Chaleff (2009), Kellerman (2008), and Kelley (1988, 1992) indicate that a follower’s engagement to organizational tasks and goals is foundational to the construct of followership and determining the role
followers play in leadership. A follower’s engagement to the organization creates a context, where followers can emerge from the group as leaders to support the larger organization. My results support the growing understanding between the importance of OE and its connection to leadership behavior. The findings are in line with similar studies that looked at OE and an organizational member’s leader behavior such as conceiving, designing, and implementing direction for the organization (Lockwood, 2007), efficiency of task completion (Konrad, 2009), and energy and support in organizational task completion (Vosburgh, 2008).

So, these findings support hypotheses 1a and 1b; again I was surprised to find that OC measures had a much smaller correlation with SRLEB compared to OE. This leads me to believe that a follower’s psychological relational state with his or her organization may have far less effect on church members emerging as leaders than I previously expected. But the organizational members that are fully engaged in organizational tasks like goal completion, fulfilled work roles, and were enthusiastically involved within the organization showed a stronger likelihood to self identify with emergent leadership behavior. This connection of self identification of leader emergent behavior and OE may also stem from the belief that churches are service organizations and everyone is expected to engage in service to the community of faith (Mallory, 2009).

**Organizational commitment and engagement.** Multiple regressions were used to test the synergistic effects of OC and OE on SRLEB, hypothesis 1c. A multiple regression analysis was run between the two explanatory variables and self-reported emergent leadership behavior to test for a reduction in the amount of the variance; however, the results indicated that organizational engagement was the only significant
explanatory variable in the simple model. This result suggests the strength of the organizational member’s engagement in the collective is better at reducing the unexplained variance in SRLEB than a church member’s OC. The results only partially support hypothesis 1c. Again, I expected to see OC have a much stronger and significant effect on SRLEB because previous studies have shown that a person’s commitment to his or her work place is an important precursor to the willingness to extend himself or herself on behalf of the common good or organizational goal (Ellemers et al., 1998). This could also could be due to the fact that my own biases and previous observations have led me to believe that the more committed a person is to his or her church, the more likely they are to take on leadership responsibilities, but this does not seem to be the case at least in this particular church. Emergent leadership behavior is more strongly affected by those organizational members already enthusiastically engaged in collective tasks within the community of faith. I also could not rule out that this church could be an anomaly compared to other churches but cannot be proven or disproven within the scope of this study.

Forward and backward regressions using the subscales of OE and OC, instead of the total scores, were also run to determine which subscales had a stronger effect in the regression and give a better detailed understanding about the type of engagement or commitment church members are displaying that correspond to emergent leadership behavior. The results of the regression indicate that absorption from the engagement scale, normative and continuance from the commitment subscales were the only subscales that showed a significant reduction in the amount of unexplained variance. However, continuance from the commitment subscale had a negative relationship within
the model. These findings suggest that while absorption and normative commitment are the strongest factors in explaining SRLEB, continuance does have a counter effect in the model.

Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization and as a result members remain with an organization because they feel they ought to remain or the social cost is too great to leave the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). This negative impacting result on SRLEB could be reflective of the organizational members’ understanding that they are socially expected to be a member of the organization, possible through family ties, but refuse to lead or act as a leader within the church. Some members may feel like they are forced to be in the organization but simultaneously feel no obligation lead. Also church members may think in terms of family units where an organizational member chooses not to emerge as a leader because another family member may already be represented in leadership of the church so the members refuses leadership to prevent over representation. In fact, those members not within a strongly represented family social structure within the church may find it easier to emerge as a leader without the burden of larger family social pressures to reflect the expected image of an organizational leader.

**Homophily.** The second set of hypotheses looked at the network relationships and the proximity between members that shared similar organizational commitment, engagement, and self-reported leader emergent behavior measures. This desire to associate and form relationships with like-minded people is also known as homophily. This study uses two test statistics to determine homophily. The Moran I statistic ranges from -1.0 as a perfect negative correlation through 0 (no correlation) to +1.0 a perfect
positive correlation. The statistic is designed to measure the variable in relation to the whole network. The Geary C statistic has a value of 1.0 when there is no association and values less than 1.0 indicate a positive association, values greater than 1.0 indicate a negative association. Both the Moran I and Geary C statistic that measure homophily are constructed like a regular correlation coefficient though the scale is slightly different in the Geary C statistic. The Geary C statistic is described as being more sensitive to local differences than to global differences. So, the Geary C statistic reflects a measurement of members’ relationally close contacts and Moran I reflects the distribution of the attribute across the network (Borgatti et al., 2013).

A small positive correlation was found using the Moran’s I statistic to reveal that people with similar organizational commitment and organizational engagement attributes tend to be socially closer to each other across the entire social network of the church than those that have difference commitment and engagement measures. However, self-reported emergent leadership behavior showed a slightly stronger positive correlation indicating church members that share similar attributes of self-reported emergent leadership behavior are found in closer proximity across the network. These findings show that organizational engagement and self-reported emergent leadership behaviors tend to occur in particular areas of the church’s social network in relative close proximity to each other in the social structure of the church.

Modest positive correlations were found using the Geary C statistic for commitment and engagement but no correlation was found in the self-reported emergent leadership behavior. It indicates that people prefer relationships with like-minded people when it comes to commitment and engagement. The Geary C statistic indicates that
individuals in the social network prefer friends and peers with similar attributes, but again based on the Moran I statistic, they are not equally distributed across the entire network. Figure 6.1 shows the self-reported emergent leadership behavior distribution across the network. Organizational members with strong measures in self-reported emergent leadership behavior are marked in red, modest measures in yellow, and little to no self-reported emergent leadership behavior in light blue. The sociogram shows the tendency for self-reported emergent leadership behavior to be seen more frequently in the core or central part of the network measured by Moran I statistic. However, the Geary C statistic reveals that immediate peers and close social contacts’ measures are not correlated with someone self-identifying as demonstrating leader emergent behavior.
These measures taken together reveal that the social network of church members is “clumpy” when it comes to commitment and engagement. Commitment and engagement occur in groups of people who more highly connected with each other, but again there is an uneven distribution of commitment and engagement across the network. What we do know from the Moran I and Geary C findings is that people with similar
measures of commitment and engagement tend to form and maintain relationships in a particular area like the core or the central component in the network, which is the definition of homophily (McPherson et al., 2001).

So to sum, the Moran I and Geary C measures show pockets of similarly committed and uncommitted members and pockets of similarly engaged and unengaged members exist across the network. People tend to gravitate and maintain relationships with people of similar commitment level and engagement level, but this is not the same pattern found in self-reported emergent leadership behavior. SRLEB shows a modest positive correlation from a global network perspective, which indicates that leadership emergent behavior is occurring in the network but in localized areas (Voelker, McDowell, & Harris, 2013). The Geary C to test for local homophily shows no correlation between SRLEB and immediate social connections. In other words, the friends or close social connections a person has in the church have no correlation with people displaying emergent leadership behavior.

These findings support H2a and H2b testing the network for organizational commitment and engagement homophily. However, H2c is only partially supported. I expected to find negative correlation in the network, but the homophily tests show a slight tendency for network members who display SRLEB across the network, but no correlation was shown between organizational members who showed SRLEB and their close social connections. Other stronger social forces shape the social network of the church beyond organizational commitment and engagement. Some of the homophilic forces shaping the social formations could be education level, gender, social status,
Leaders are emerging from a particular area within the social network, but the local measure shows a slight or no correlation with emergent leadership behavior so immediate friends are not effecting SRLEB. These results taken together show localized areas in the network where people show emergent leader behavior, (the core) but those emerging as leaders do not seem to be affected by their immediate peers.

Exploring the data a little more I decided to do the same Moran I and Gary C statistical analyses with peer-reported leader emergent behavior (see Figure 6.2). Organizational members with strong measures in peer-reported emergent leadership behavior are marked in red, modest measures in yellow, and little to no self-reported emergent leadership behavior in light blue. The sociogram shows the peer-reported emergent leadership behavior to be more “spread out” in the network. It was surprising to see that every faction recognized using the faction algorithm identifies at least one organizational member as a strong peer-reported leader showing emergent behavior. This indicates that followers could be fulfilling the role of leaders for their subgroup or faction without personally identifying as a leader. A person could be leading in the organization without fully realizing the leadership role he or she is playing for the rest of the group. This strongly supports the social constructionist component of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) and other followership theories focusing on a social constructionist view (Collinson, 2006; Tee, Paulsen, & Ashkanasy, 2013; Uhl-Bien & Pillai, 2007).
Figure 6.2. Sociogram Showing Core/Periphery and Faction with PRLEB

The final set of hypotheses examines the correlations of social network measures: density, degree, eigenvector centrality and peer-reported emergent leader behavior. Ego density in social network analysis refers to the number of relationships that exist in a person’s immediate social connections divided by the possible number of relationships that could exist among those same social connections (Marin & Wellman, 2011). There was a small negative and significant correlation between density and peer-reported
emergent leadership behavior. This reinforces the notion that the more connected an organizational member’s peers are the less likely the organizational member is to be viewed as a leader by their peers (Burt, 2005; Li, 2013), which does not support H3a. Social network leadership theorists have long suspected that when a person socially bridges people and groups together in a network it gives this person, the bridge, more access to information and resources and possible influence (Krackhardt, 1990; Krackhardt & Kilduff, 1990). This perspective explains why the more connected your friends are, the least likely you are to be recognized as a leader (Huggins et al., 2012; Mehra et al., 2006). There is a noteworthy reduction of leverage and influence from a network perspective when peers do not have to go through the leader for information and other resources needed for organizational tasks (Brass, 1985; McCallum & O’Connell, 2009; Wasserman & Faust, 1994).

H₃b was supported with a significant but small positive correlation between degree, how many social connections a person has and the peer-reported emergent leadership behavior. This is similar to the density measure but solely looks at the number of social connections a person has within the network and not the possible connections. It makes sense that as a person emerges as a leader, his or her influence and social connectivity also expands (Huggins et al., 2012; Li, 2013).

Finally, a significant modest positive correlation was found between peer-reported emergent leadership behavior and eigenvector centrality. Eigenvector of geodesic distances is used to establish network importance of organizational members (Borgatti et al., 2013; Mehra et al., 2006). The eigenvector approach is an attempt to identify the most central actors in terms of the global or overall structure of the network, and to
simultaneously establish less value to organizational members further away from the influential central part of the social network (Mehra et al., 2006). It is not how many people a person knows in the social network, it is also knowing the right people in the network (Burt, 2005; McDonald, 2011). In this study a correlation demonstrates knowing and maintaining the right relationships help others in the network see organizational members as leaders.

**Summary**

As a summary I would like to quickly cover the findings in this section of the chapter so far. Emergent leadership behavior is correlated with organizational engagement, surprisingly organizational commitment did not have nearly as strong correlations as I expected. A person’s ability to be absorbed by the tasks and jobs within the church and his or her beliefs that a person has a cultural obligation or sense of duty to remain with the organization are factors contributing to leader emergence behavior, but if a church member feels he or she needs to be committed because he or she cannot leave the church for social reasons (like family expectations), the organizational member is less likely to show behaviors of emerging leader. Finally, people in the church that feel the same about organizational commitment and organizational engagement tend to group together in the social network displaying homophily. And even though leader emergent behavior tends to occur in specific areas of the social network, there is no correlation between church members in close proximity and a member’s likelihood to display leader emergence behavior.
Implications of Quantitative Findings

My first research question asks, “How does a follower’s organizational commitment and organizational engagement influence the likelihood of assuming roles of informal leadership in the organization?” The findings of this study show that while high levels of engagement may be a contributing reason for an individual to emerge as an informal leader, a member’s commitment to the organization may have little or no effect. This could be because the more a person engages in the day-to-day activities and tasks in the organization, the more likely he or she is to see the need for tasks or goal completion and create changes in vision for the greater good. Whereas those organizational members not engaged in the organization would not know about or care for common organizational tasks or goal completion. Not being engaged in organizational tasks could also be a reflection that particular organizational members place personal needs before the needs of the organization or the church (Domning, 2006). Those organizational members could be displaying a sense of selfishness and do not see the need for engagement in collective activities because they may only be concerned about their own needs being met by the organization.

The lack of organizational commitment in the role of emerging leadership behavior is surprising but could be explained by how individual members view the role of the church. Since commitment is viewed as a psychological state that characterizes the member’s relationship with the organization and determines the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991), many members may be tentatively continuing membership knowing they can discontinue membership at anytime because they are not truly committed. An individual’s organizational
commitment may be keeping him or her in membership as long as personal needs of the member are being met, but there is no expected reciprocation of meeting the needs of the organization. However, the organizational members’ engagement scores could reflect the expectation of reciprocation.

If the goal of organizational leaders is to create an organizational structure to allow informal leaders to emerge, leaders of the church should spend more time “plugging people in” to activities that benefit the collective and spend less time worrying about a member’s affective commitment level. A large amount of highly committed people may only be reflective of the number of members whose level of commitment is contingent on their individual needs being met and not necessarily a commitment to the success of the organization. But, if leaders can find ways to engage new and old members, that would have a much stronger influence on church members being recognized as emerging leaders.

My second research question asks, “Do emerging leadership behaviors, organizational commitment, and/or organizational engagement influence the development of the organization’s social network?” To address this question my second and third set of hypotheses look at the social network and its attributes. The statistical analyses demonstrate social relationships have a strong and significant impact on emergent leadership behavior. The social network of the church does show homophilic behavior when it comes to engagement, which indicates that if my friends are engaged in the collective activities, I am more likely to be engage in collective activities. Or, if I am the type of person who likes to be engaged, I am more likely to form or maintain relationships with people who are similar to me when it comes to engagement.
Leaders in the organization need to focus on using the church’s social network to encourage stronger engagement to lead to informal leader emergence. Leaders could rely on already engaged church members to invite their friends and family who are not engaged. This serves two purposes. First, it uses the homophily to advantage of the organization by asking engaged members to draw other members into collective tasks. There is a strong likelihood that social relationships in the network already exist among the people who are similar and close in their views of the importance of being engaged in the community. Those social relationships can help tip the balance and encourage more engagement from members that are not as fully engaged. So, members that are less engaged than their peers may become more involved if they were asked to take on tasks and activities in the church by those they feel relationally close. The second purpose is the continual development of the social relationships within the church. When people serve together, relational bonds are developed, maintained, and strengthened, which creates a stronger possibility for influence in future activities (Obst & White, 2007). The invitation to serve could also have an effect of an organizational member moving away from a selfish view of the church that is supposed to meet his or her needs. For example, a person’s attitude could move from “what does the church do for me?” to more of a communal understanding of the church and how he or she could contribute to the greater good (Mallory, 2009).

Social network positioning also determines a person’s ability to be seen as an emerging leader in the church. The amount of social ties, friendships, and connections an organizational member is associated with the likelihood they are recognized as a leader but also having the right friends seems to matter even more. One of the more interesting
findings in this study is the more a person’s friends are connected to each other, the less likely that person will be recognized as an emerging leader by his or her peers. The implication is that having friends in the organization helps members if he or she can find social places within the network to bridge unconnected people groups, then the member is more likely to be recognized as a leader. As discussed previously in this chapter, if a member’s friends are connected they do not need to go through the member for information or for other resources thus reducing the ability to be recognized as a person of influence by the member’s peers. The formal leaders in the church will need to be mindful of potential emerging leaders and find creative ways to connect them to key influential people in the organization (Krackhardt, 1987). Mentorship programs could also be a way to create those specific social connections that would help individual members emerge as a leader (Lapierre et al., 2012).

The quantitative results from the study are inconclusive and do not provide enough evidence to determine a causal relationship. However, it can be easily argued that emergent leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and organizational engagement influence the development of the social network. Also it is clear that the social network within the organization does correlate with a person’s commitment and engagement levels, which in turn affects the likelihood an organizational member, could emerge as an informal leader.

**Review and Discussion of Qualitative Findings**

The third research question asks, “How do followers hinder or promote emergent leadership behavior in each other through their social context within the organization?” A series of fourteen interviews were conducted to allow organizational members to recall
and express their experiences observing leaders emerge, emerging as a leader, and how the organization failed in allowing people to grow as a leader, or prevented people from being a leader in the church. The strongest thematic categories included: relationships, engagement, commitment, prototype, training and equipping, leaders are encouraged or discouraged, and mentorship. It became evident through the course of the interviews that the social process of leader emergence occurs over time and in several stages. Each stage serves as a screening activity for the potential leader by the group, and it is based on how the potential leader’s peers interact and evaluate the emerging potential leader. This type of evaluation process from organizational member’s peers could encourage or discourage and even prevent a potential leader from emerging as an informal leader within the organization.

In fact, the themes that surfaced through the interviews were easily categorized into the three stages organizational members must go through to emerge as a leader among their peers similar to findings of Carson et al. (2007) and Bolden (2011). Those stages are peer recognition as a potential leader candidate, group prototype evaluation, and leadership support or discouragement. It is also important to understand that this three-stage review of potential leaders is not a formal process but a natural response to determine if organizational members endorse another person’s informal leadership. Leader endorsement is an independent and individual process. Just because one peer recognizes a fellow follower as a potential leader in the organization does not mean everyone evaluates the potential leader the same way. Potential leadership ability is more of an informal aggregate of peer opinions and not necessarily a singular universal evaluation of the potential leader.
Peer recognition as a potential leader candidate. The first four themes act as a collective organizational evaluation to determine if a group member could potentially be a leader candidate. Most members interviewed in this study interchanged the terms leadership and community service. This is certainly not an accurate understanding of leadership even in servant leadership theory models (Greenleaf, 2002; Northouse, 2010) but this does indicate the expectation of serving the community and putting personal needs aside for the collective good. This expectation of serving the community is also tied to the members’ understanding of being committed to the organization, but again this is not the classic psychological understanding of a member being committed to an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991) but is instead an expectation of dependability and reliability that creates trust for fulfilling organizational tasks (McAllister, 1995). Service to the community and assisting in meeting the needs of others is expected for potential leaders.

Potential informal leaders are also expected by their peers to be engaged in church activities. “I remember when I [started] being impressed with [her], not standing back and waiting for somebody to say something she just jumped in” (Participant 023). Emergent leaders in the church were identified by how they engage with other people, activities, and ministries. Most often interviewees described an expectation of emotional and intellectual commitment to the church and church activities. One of the participants commented: “I think just the steady dedication, kind of commitment, you know. Those are the words that come to mind when I think of [leaders]” (Participant 016). An argument can be made that an emergent leader’s engagement is just a conduit by which his or her peers measure commitment and revealing the leader’s reliability and
dependency. But a potential leader’s engagement to a task is different than just recognizing a task that needs to be completed; this type of engagement is about a sense of ownership to the shared collective tasks necessary for the organization.

The final evaluation of potential emerging leadership candidates is their relationships. The church is a community of organizational members interconnected by relationships made up of friends and family. Participants revealed the importance of developing and maintaining relationships to develop trust in the church even before a leader emerges. “Well, I think I would have to know a little bit about [the new leader]. I'd have to know them in a personal way I think, to trust them as leaders” (Participant 127). Each relationship represents a social connection by which leadership can take place (R. L. Cross & Parker, 2004). As far as the organizational members are concerned, if you cannot manage people as your friends, then you most likely will not be able to manage followers if you find yourself in a leadership position. Relationships are fundamental to both formal and informal church leadership (Mehra et al., 2006).

**Group prototype evaluation.** Participants’ comments indicate a shared understanding that all leaders, formal or informal, should reflect the ideals and represent the group. Leaders cannot separate themselves from the consideration and expectations of the group the leader represents (Haslam, 2001). Organizational members cognitively represent the defining and stereotyping attributes of groups in the form of prototypes (Hogg, 2001). Members displaying leadership in a given context need to be representative of the shared social identity, values, acceptable behavior, and consensual positions of the group (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001). When coupled with the importance of social relationships,
prototype matching and social attraction are important aspects of group life in leadership selection. A collective idea of the attributes potential leaders should have before they are allowed to emerge as leaders was revealed in the interviews. The attributes that were revealed in the interviews were engagement, reliability, dependability, shared religious and doctrinal convictions of the church, caring for others, and trustworthiness.

Prototypes are typically not a checklist of attributes but are usually a fuzzy set of ideals that capture the context dependent features of group membership (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). These features describe a shared idea of exemplary members that best embodied the group (Hogg & Terry, 2000). If potential emerging leaders do not measure up to the prototypical expectation, for example, shared theological and doctrinal conviction, they can still remain a member of the community but the group selection process will not allow the person to emerge as a leader. If the potential leader does not represent the shared idea of what it means to be an organizational leader, he or she will be greatly restricted by the organization members as an emerging leader.

**Leadership support or discouragement.** The community needs to encourage leaders to emerge so that the organization can continue meeting needs of the community by ensuring organizational tasks and goals are completed (Neubert & Taggar, 2004). The church is dependent on members emerging as informal leaders to ensure the tasks necessary to organizational maintenance are accomplished (Mallory, 2009). The interviews revealed community members understand that emergent leaders assist formal leadership through coordinating regular church activities such as Sunday school teachers, care workers for children, care workers for senior adults, community ministry workers, leaders of small study groups, and supporters of church administration. These findings
also suggest the organization needs to make encouraging leaders a priority through

different means including public recognition, kind words, and supportive behavior

(Epitropaki & Martin, 2013). Formal leaders need to take time and listen to new ideas

and guiding the informal leader into more formal leadership positions in the community.

Some participants have experienced or witnessed discouragement of emerging
leaders. “He did have a way of squashing ideas, and I think we're still paying for that.

People are afraid to step out” (Participant 121). Discouragement emotionally wears both

formal and emerging leaders down and can cause burnout or leaders to quit (Maslach et
al., 2001; Schaufeli et al., 2009). So, discouragement can be used both, intentionally or
unintentionally, to keep people from emerging as leaders. The lack of support, lack of
recognition, and isolating potential leaders has been used by the organization to
discourage people from leading. Each of these activities leads to an odd group dynamic
of hoping that an idea (or someone), which does not meet the prototype standard, would
just fade away or be given up for a better more prototypical idea. “I don’t know that we
intentionally discourage leadership. Maybe we don’t make it real easy for people to lead
and continue leading” (Participant 077). This passive technique that ignores non-
prototypical people puts the church in an interesting position. On one hand, the social and

group processes will not allow a person or an idea that does not “measure up” to be in a
position to represent the group; but on the other hand, the criticism cannot be harsh or
damaging enough to the person’s identity where they would consider withdrawing their
membership from the organization and joining another community of faith. This creates a
system where passive discipline discourages the leadership of an unworthy leader or idea,
but unfortunately, this system perpetuates informal power structures and stifles new ideas and new influential groups within the organization.

**Participant Recommendations.** Participants were concerned about the lack of training and equipping for all leaders in the organization and this lack of training is seen as one of the reasons that keep people from stepping up and emerging as a leader. Though this is not in the three-stage emerging leaders process, the recommendation of a training and equipping for leaders is a plea from organizational members to make the emerging leader process more understandable, so people know exactly what is expected from the organizational member to emerge as a leader. “I try to find the way. Where do you go? Who do you talk to? And how is that nurtured? How are the decisions made that does not fit in the vision of the church? Is that something we do? Can we direct you in a little different way? Where is that vehicle now? We don't have that. There is little to no guidance” (Participant 016).

Training and equipping sessions could be used to help church members to connect with others and identify communal needs that could be addressed by church members while also learning what the community of faith specifically expects from young and inexperienced leaders. These specific concerns fall inline with the first two stages of the leader emergence within the organization: the recognition of potential leader candidate as well as the group prototype evaluation. Most people want to know exactly what behavior and knowledge are expected from them before their peers or formal leadership evaluates them. Leadership training and equipping events could fill this space for emerging leaders.

The participants also expressed the need for a formal plan where emerging leaders enter into a relationship with more experienced leaders so that leaders with more
experience and more knowledge can help guide a less experienced leader in the church. Mentorship also ties into the expected leader activity of developing relationships and increasing the group recognition of the emerging leader. Mentors can introduce the emerging leader to new opportunities and new acquaintances, which has shown to have benefits to both the organization and the newly emerging leader (Solansky, 2010). These new relationships create a social structure where collaboration can be encouraged as well as new avenues for resource access in the organization (J. E. Cross et al., 2009).

Summary

Before I discuss the implications of these findings, I would like to quickly cover the important results in the qualitative findings section. Emergent leadership behavior is dependent on peer perception of organizational engagement, commitment (dependability and reliability), and the maintenance of social relationships in the church. When a follower fulfills or excels in these perceptions the follower separates from the rest of his or her peers in the group. This separation could make the follower a candidate as an emerging leader in the organization. The candidate is also expected to live up to and model the norms, beliefs, behaviors, and values of the organization also known as prototypicality. Depending on how the emerging leader lines up to the group expectations the potential leaders could be encouraged or discouraged to lead in the organization by both the formal leaders in the organization and the follower’s peers. The results create a dynamic environment where people could be continuously encouraged to emerge as a leader or to be discouraged in moments when the leader does not live up to group expectations. This system of encouragement and discouragement results in a leader shaping social process performed by formal leaders and the organizational members.
Implications of Qualitative Findings

The third and final research question asks, “How do followers hinder or promote emergent leadership behavior in each other through their social context within the organization?” The church in this study actually has an informal unspoken process, which allows leaders to emerge from within the organization. The selection of informal leaders is conducted as a group process where a person is separated from his or her peers to emerge as a leader in the organization. The system in place at the church is not a formally recognized system, but from the interviews group members could easily identify the system at work. Their description of how leaders emerge recognizes each component of the leader selection process. Figure 6.3 gives a visual representation of how the emergent leadership system operates in this particular community of faith that is revealed through the organizational members’ interview transcripts that reflect their leadership experiences in the church.
Early research by Mann (1959) gives a starting point to understand how organizational member behavior can lead to leadership emergence. Mann offered three behaviors from organizational member that separate them from their peers and establish them as emerging leaders. Those behaviors Mann established were satisfying the needs of others in the organization, fulfilling roles necessary for a group to function successfully, and exhibiting traits that are associated with or trigger socially defined leadership expectations of others (Mann, 1959). Each of these behaviors is represented in the model above, but Mann’s model does not take into account the individual cognitive processes which allow group members to follow the emerging leader. The proposed model for this church takes the deficits of Mann’s model into account and moves from behavior and trait based approach to a richer social psychological approach.
The above model is also similar to Carson et al. (2007) model of emerging leaders in a shared leadership environments within teams. Carson et al. (2007) identified two conditions for leaders to emerge in a shared environment. The first social condition is the team environment supports the emergence of leaders. Second, formal and external organizational leaders provide a level of supportive coaching to the group. The team environment that fosters this type of emerging leadership environment has three dimensions: shared purpose, social support, and voice. Shared purpose is when team members have a similar understanding of the team’s primary objectives and goals. This is demonstrated through commitment, empowerment, and willingness of organizational members to share and take ownership in the responsibility of success. The above model uses peer recognition to identify a potential leader candidate and it incorporates similar concepts of engagement, relationships, and commitment to serve the community, which could be shown in the Carson et al. (2007) model. However, the Carson et al. (2007) model still does not take into consideration the importance of group member prototype evaluation, which is the second stage of the church’s emerging leader model.

The third component of the proposed church model is the output or consequence of reflecting (or not reflecting) the group’s values, beliefs and behaviors. Those leaders that reflect the group norms will continue to be connected, encouraged, and supported whereas those that do not reflect the group norms will be isolated, rebuffed and restricted as a leader.

One more observation needs to be made about the above model: Carson et al. (2007) makes a reference to the importance of voice. Voice is the degree to which an organizational member can have input into how the team carries out its purposes and
goals. Voice preserves the individual identity when measured to the prototypical standard shared by the group. It is possible in certain instances that the prototypical leader is given enough latitude to define the group prototype (Haslam, 2001). So the emerging leader is constantly being defined by and defining the cognitive image of the group prototype. Voice can actually be seen as the ability for the emerging leader to shape the values, behaviors, and expectations of the prototypical leader thus changing the norms for all group members. As the emergent leader continues to be measured by the prototype or disagrees with the prototype, he or she may have to make the difficult decision to continue to adhere to the group norms and expectations of leaders and let go of his or her personal identity. Or the leader must decide to act based on a different set of values and beliefs risking the possibility that as a leader she or he may be discouraged to lead or be socially isolated by the other organizational members.

Merging Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The convergent design of this study allows the results of the quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures and analysis to form a more complete picture by providing different insights and seeing the problem from multiple angles and perspectives (Creswell, 2015). Both qualitative and quantitative analyses along with the social network analysis offer useful results, but together they offer more data and the ability to advance multiple perspectives and validate the different complementary data sets with the other (Creswell, 2015).

Organizational member engagement and the importance of organizational relationships were strongly supported in both sets of data and both data types indicated engagement and relationship were antecedents to emerging leadership behavior. The
survey reported strong correlations between leader emergence behavior and organizational engagement. At the same time, relationships with significant people in the church’s social network had a medium correlation with reported emerging leadership behavior. Every participant interviewed reflected on the importance of both leaders and emerging leaders being socially connected in the church, and the majority talked about the significance of being engaged and committed to serving people and ministries in the church.

During the interviews, participants discussed the leadership behaviors of others in the organization. When the participants were asked to share stories to support their observations of other group members displaying leadership behavior, they gave examples where others in leadership position or emerging as a leader in the church. However, when the organizational members were asked about their own personal experiences as a leader and stories about how they emerged as leaders, most replied that they did not see themselves as leaders in the organization. This could be a social norm or expectation of the church culture to display humility when talking about your own experiences, but the survey revealed only a moderate correlation between self and peer-reported emergent leadership behavior. In this study I expected to see a higher level of correlation between self and peer-reported leadership behavior. By combining both the qualitative interview data and quantitative survey data, I found strong support indicating that peers encouraging one another in leadership have a strong effect on helping people emerge as leaders in the organization to see themselves as leaders. The combined data create space to examine self-efficacy issues in the church where others see group members as leaders, but participants do not see themselves as leaders. This can be seen in the comparison of
sociograms of self-reported and peer-reported leader emergent behavior (see Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2).

One of the challenging parts of the study was discovering that the organizational members had a different understanding of organizational commitment, which could have only been revealed through this type of mixed method study. From the beginning of the study, I have used the commonly shared definition of organization commitment used by organizational psychologists and organizational behavior researchers (Le Blanc & González-Romá, 2012; Loi, Lai, & Lam, 2012; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 1993; Neale & Northcraft, 1991). The survey designed for this study implemented the most commonly used instrument for measuring organizational engagement and organizational commitment. But as I conducted interviews, it became apparent that when church members talked about organizational commitment they were talking more about reliability and dependability in members and not necessarily the psychological bond that a member has with the organization. That is not to say the results of this study are invalidated, but the measure for organizational commitment that were conducted in this study could be confusing for organizational leaders and members when they see the results. Those results may not line up with what they expected to see because they have a different idea about organizational commitment. Again, without merging the data sets this issue would have never been revealed and thus the possibility of organizational members incorrectly interpreting the results of this study based on poor assumptions made about the data.
Limitations

The study focuses solely on a single church organization. Many of the findings are restricted specifically to the population of this organization. A hundred participants were used in data collection, but all data came from this single organization. Caution should be used when attempting to draw any generalizations about emergent leaders or the process that emerging leaders go through in other nonprofit organizations or churches. However, the findings in this study could be used as a starting point to evaluate the emergent leadership behavior in other churches or larger nonprofit organizations.

The church organization being used is also geographically contained to a south-central state. Regions in the United States may have different social expectations creating a different set of group norms and expected behavior. Churches from different denominations or other communities of faith not centered on Jesus could be structured differently, which would dramatically change how the social network is formed and maintained over time. For example, some communities of faith separate men and women in worship, study, and ministry. Separating men and women would have an effect on how the social network is formed and maintained. Future researchers would have to compensate by creating a bipartite graph or possibility study male and female social networks independently from each other.

This study also contains some bias from me as a researcher. I am a pastor of a different church congregation. The organization being studied is similar to my own community of faith and is geographically close to my own church, which could create personal assumptions about the church and how the church operates as a social organization. The quantitative portion of this study, the survey, may limit some of the
bias, but my interpretation of the numbers and interviews could be influenced by my own experiences as a church leader. I have tried to take precautions in the interpretation of the data by following up with organizational leaders and interviewees to be sure my interpretations are accurate and reflective of participants in the study.

All participants recognized me as both the primary researcher but also as a pastor that serves a sister church in the region. As an ordained minister, I am viewed as a person of authority and can be perceived as a representative of the larger church denomination. This could cause problems when participants were asked about experiences within their local church. Participants’ biases could cause the participants to withhold experiences or stories that make up the local emergent leadership narrative if participants feel the stories and events could put their church in a bad light.

This study does rely heavily on self-reported measures and poor self-evaluation could lead to the possibility of inaccuracies of self-evaluations. However, participants have been asked to reflect on their own understanding of the organizational reality and thus respond to that personal reality. So regardless of the accuracy of the different types of self-reported evaluations, the individual’s behavior and affective measures are the focus of the study and neither should be impacted greatly by any possible difference between perceived reality and reality.

Finally, participants also had the option of taking or not taking the survey. A skew in the data could exist because emotionally engaged organizational members are more likely to participate in a surveys about their organization because they are engaged and are deeply connected to the future of the organization. The skew would result in overemphasized engagement values as one of the independent variables in the study.
**Future Directions for Research**

This study is focused on a single organization and the members within, but it could be expanded to several communities of faith from the same region or denomination creating a network of churches. Researchers could look at how churches affect each other in the areas of commitment, engagement, and emerging leaders.

I would like to see how various congregational government structures affect the commitment, engagement, and social network outcomes. Churches with patriarchal or masculine formal leadership structures like the Roman Catholic or Baptist Church could show a strong social network among men but reveal women in key positions actually have more influence from an informal leadership position. These governmental structures may create a completely different social structure. For example, churches that appoint formal leadership rather than elect church leaders may require a different level of commitment and engagement from the parishioners to emerge as leaders.

A better instrument to examine organizational commitment in nonprofit organizations could also help fill the gap in this study. Participants often cited that organizational commitment is very important for emerging leader, but the Meyer and Allen (1991) instrument may not have been the best instrument to measure the organizational commitment they were describing in the interviews. After the interviews were complete, I discovered the organization defined commitment with terms like dedication and reliability which is a different commitment construct than Meyer and Allen (1991) idea of commitment which is a psychological bond between member and organization.
Finally, this project was designed as a cross-sectional study and all data were collected over the span of five months. The study could be extended by collecting data over a multi-year or multi-month time span conducting surveys every month to monitor changes in the social network as well as monitor the changes in the commitment and engagement levels of members within the organization. Researchers could also be able to track emerging leaders to see what attributes and experiences help emerging leaders continue to lead or hinder them as leaders. They could track what positions or responsibilities emerging leaders are entrusted with as well as how new organizational member emerge as leaders. A longitudinal study could give a lot more possibilities for data collection and better interpretation.

**Implications**

This study helps fill in the gaps of understanding the role of followers can play in the leadership process within an organization. The role of follower needs to take a more prominent role in leadership theory and leadership research. The role, behavior, and traits of leaders have been studied over the last century while the role of followers has been undervalued. This study helps reverse this trend and looks at leadership through the eyes of the followers and the difference followers can make in an organization.

**Research and Theory**

This mixed-method study and social network analysis has also demonstrated how multiple different research paradigms can be used together to give a richer and fuller set of data that can lead to a better understanding of leadership events than a single research paradigm could supply. A mixed-method study takes a multi-level approach to look at how specific attributes of individuals affect their ability to emerge as leaders but it also
looks at their relationships as well. Future research of leadership will need to take similar
multi-level and mixed method approach to better understand the internal and external
forces that allow people to influence one another. This research project is an example of
how future studies in leadership could examine the individual, the social connections that
allow influence to occur in the organization as well as the shared collective ideas of how
followers can emerge as leaders and influence an organization.

Social psychological studies look at how the internal social forces in a person’s
cognitive thought process shape their beliefs and actions. These studies rarely look
outside the individual to understand where and how external social forces affect the
individual. Social network analysis in this study shows a lot of promise in these types of
studies because researchers can essentially map external social forces by mapping a
participant’s relationship and show how peers can affect an individual’s cognitive
thought process. Researchers can look beyond the individual internal processes and look
to external relationships as influential social psychological forces that weight people’s
internal beliefs and actions. Leadership is just one social science discipline that can
explore how those external relational forces affect an individual.

Practice

Relationships are important in any organization and allow leadership to take
place. In nonprofit and service organizations, such as churches, relationships are how
leaders accomplish task and goals. This study has revealed that a person’s psychological
attachment to an organization is not nearly as important as a person who is deeply
involved in their organization. Organizational leaders who want to find ways of
multiplying their leadership effort among followers should look to organizational
members that are already engaged in work for the organization and not necessarily people who have a high affinity towards the organization. Leaders should look towards people who have become absorbed in activities in the organization, for they are a great source of future leaders.

Social networks exist in any organization where people are working together. Social networks are a good starting point for any leader, formal or informal, to understand how people influence each other in the organization. Leaders should use the known social structures in the group to encourage and inspire organization members into organizational involvement and engagement. Personal relationships can have a strong effect on organizational members so when leaders understand and can use their social network, they can lead their peers and encourage them to engage in leader emergent behavior to increase the leader’s influence in the organization.

**Conclusion**

I have constructed a study to examine leadership from a follower’s perspective, specifically looking at how followers in an organization can shape direction, vision, and goal attainment in their organization through informal leadership or leader emergent behavior. This study joins a greater conversation in determining the qualities and characteristics as well as the social construct among followers that lead their peers through emergent leadership behavior.

This complementary mixed methods study along with a social network analysis of the organization used a three-phase convergent design to merge the results of quantitative data with qualitative data. The convergence of data types allowed both types of collected
data to provide different insights and allowed the study to examine the problem from multiple angles as well as perspectives (Creswell, 2015).

The first phase was a small set of initial interviews to establish what behaviors and activities promote relationships in the organization. The second phase is a survey used to establish social network measures from relationship data in the church as well as measure the multivariate associations between the dependent, leader emergent behavior, and independent variables, organizational commitment and organizational engagement. The final phase was a more substantial set of interviews to evaluate the leadership narrative of the local congregation. This established three research questions used as a guide to shape the research and hypotheses of this study.

How does a follower’s organizational commitment and organizational engagement influence the likelihood of assuming roles of informal leadership in the organization? In this study I was able to examine the relationship between the variables organizational commitment, organizational engagement, and leader emergent behavior in a local church. I found that organizational commitment had much less effect on emergent leadership behavior than I though it would, but engagement had a much stronger effect, particularly when followers become absorbed in their service and work in their community of faith. Followers tend to show leader emergent behavior when they are activity engaged in serving the church community. Interview data supported that commitment is very important for leader to display but commitment was defined by organizational members as reliability and dependability in church members and not necessarily the psychological bond that a member has with the organization.
Does emerging leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and/or organizational engagement influence the development of the organization’s social network? This study showed that organizational members displayed homophily in organizational commitment and organizational engagement. Homophily is the tendency for likeminded people to form and maintain relationships so as the saying goes birds of a feather flock together. The surprise in this part of the study showed that leader emergent behavior exhibited two different types of homophilic behavior. Leaders emerging in the organization tend to be clustered together in the same areas specifically the core of the social network. So, no correlation existed with leaders in close relationships with other leaders across the social network. However, the social network analysis showed no correlation between an emerging leader and their immediate friends, but if a member is connected to the “right” people there is a tendency for an organizational member to display leader emergent behavior.

Finally I asked, how do followers hinder or promote emergent leadership behavior in each other through their social context within the organization? In this community of faith, followers go through a series of events to be recognized as leaders emerging from within the church membership. A potential leader candidate in the church shows commitment (dependability and reliability), engagement in the greater good of the community, and formed relationships in the church. These behaviors when applied to satisfying the needs of others in the organization and fulfilling roles necessary for a group to function successfully trigger socially defined leadership expectations which allows peers to recognize the organizational member as a leader (Mann, 1959). So, members forming relationships should focus on not just quantity but quality. That is forming
relationships with particular people that were central in the social network of the church. When a person has displayed the potential to be a leader they are compared against a prototypical leader. Specifically they are evaluated by their communal beliefs and values that the rest of the followers share. If the potential leader reflects those shared beliefs and values, he or she is encouraged and supported by his or her fellow followers. If the potential leader does not reflect the shared values and beliefs, he or she is discouraged and isolated and their fellow followers begin to look towards other group members as leader candidates. It was apparent in the narrative that if a person has leadership skills, knowledge, and expertise but does not share the same beliefs and values of the community, the community will not allow the potential leader to emerge into leadership roles in the organization.
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Department: Graduate School  College: Interdisciplinary

Project Title: Followers That Lead: Relating Leadership Emergence Through Follower Commitment, Engagement, and Connectedness


FUNDING: Anticipated source of funds, if any, including UCA Research Funds. (If this project will be funded under a grant to another investigator, please give the title of the grant, name of agency or institution, and the investigator’s name.) N/A

Proposal has been (will be) submitted for funding (date):

Will proposed research be conducted with investigator(s) from other agency/institution(s)?  

☐ Yes  ☑ No

If YES, complete and attach the Study Personnel Form

Is proposed research being conducted to meet course or degree requirements at another university?  

☐ Yes  ☑ No

If YES, has the research been reviewed by that university’s IRB?  

Yes  No

If YES, what were the results? (attach approval letter)

Required Training/Education in protections for human research subjects: (Complete for each investigator.)

Name: Timothy S. Bullington  Name: 

CITI Certificates are:  ☑ attached on file  ☐ attached on file

Name: Dr. Rhonda McClellan  Name:  

CITI Certificates are:  ☑ attached on file  ☐ attached on file
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RESEARCH PARTICIPANT INFORMATION:

1. State the Category (1-7) of Expedited Research from pages 1 and 2: \# \textbf{6 and 7}

2. Total number of Participants and Controls: \textbf{210}  
   \quad \# of Males: \textbf{90} \quad \# of Females: \textbf{120}

3. Categories of Participants and Controls
   
   - Adults (18 years and over)
   - Adolescents (13-17 years of age)
   - Mid-Childhood (6-12 years of age)
   - Preschool (3-5 years of age)
   - Infants (0-2 years of age)
   - Pregnant Women
   - Other (specify):
     
   Institutional Affiliation of Participants
   
   - None
   - Schools/College/University
   - Prisons
   - Hospitals/Clinics
   - Other (specify): \underline{---------------------------}

4. Mentally Competent Adult (able to give consent) \checkmark \quad Mentally Incompetent Adult (unable to give consent) \underline{\ }

5. Demographic Information (check all applicable items):
   
   - Names
   - Social Security #s
   - Addresses
   - Phone #s
   - Age/Date of Birth
   - Sex
   - Race/Ethnicity

   Marital Status
   - Income
   - Job Title
   - Names of Employers
   - Types of Employers
   - Other (specify): \underline{---------------------------}

6. Briefly explain how the demographic information will be used.

   Age, Sex, Marital Status and Race are major variables in social network analysis to establish homophily. (Homophily is the tendency of people to form social connections with people with similar attributes or traits.)

7. How will the participants be chosen? (If using existing records, attach a copy of the permission.)

   This is a population study of an organization, \underline{---------------------------}. A membership roster of participants’ names and emails will be supplied by the organization for survey distribution. Participants will be able to opt out of the survey or decline interviews.

8. How will the participants be recruited and contacted?

   This is a population study of an organization, \underline{---------------------------}. The participants’ names and emails will be supplied by the organization for survey distribution. The organization has given consent for this study (see attached letter).

9. Will the participants receive any inducement or remuneration (e.g., $5, gift certificates, class credit) or token gifts (e.g., candy, stickers) to participate in the research? \checkmark Yes \underline{\ } No

   (If YES, describe)

   \$5 x \$50 Gift cards will be randomly awarded to participants that complete the electronic survey.

UCA IRB Expedited Application v 1014
10. What is the time requirement for the participants?

4 participants will be selected for a 20-30 minute Initial Interview, there is a 20-30 minute survey for all participants, and 5-6 participants will be selected for a 30-45 minute interview.

11. Will participants be charged for any research related procedures?  
   □ Yes  □ No
   (If YES, explain)

12. Describe any potential short and long term benefits from this research to the participants and/or society. (If there are none, state none.)

Research Participants:

None directly, however the development of a better understanding of the impact of organizational commitment and engagement of the members could help future planning and create a positive community of faith environment for the participants.

Society (Science / Scholarship):

I will be looking at organizational commitment and organizational member engagement, and how those variables lead to leader emergence behavior among followers and 'non-leaders' in the organization. Organizational commitment and organizational member engagement could possibly be used to better identify new and potential leaders in an organizations.

The authors of the Instruments being used in the study are very interested in the data of a new organization type for their instruments.

13. Study site: Where will the research be conducted? If not at UCA, has permission been granted? (Attach a copy of permission or collaboration letter.)

The primary research instrument is an electronic survey.

Paper surveys will be provided at [redacted] or those uncomfortable using computers or without internet access.

[redacted] has given permission to use their facilities as if needed.

Interviews will be conducted at [redacted] or at comfortable and safe location chosen by the participant.
RESEARCH PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Use **LAT TERMS and/or PROVIDE DEFINITIONS** of technical terminology. [Use extra pages as necessary.]

1. Briefly describe the background or justification for your research.

   Historically when an organization goes through major internal struggles often the solution is new leadership. This common response misses the importance and impact of informal leadership in the organization and the ability of an informal leader to create positive change in the absence of formal leaders that hold traditional positions of authority. Mobilizing organizational members that display emergent leadership behavior could be a much better alternative to create organizational change rather than solely relying on a new leader to bring change to an organization.

   The general purpose of this research is to determine if the combination of an individual’s organizational commitment, organizational engagement, social connectedness, is related to informal leadership behavior, also called emergent leadership behavior. Emergent leadership behavior has been shown to bring about positive organizational change in both the presence and absence of formal organizational leadership.

2. Describe your research focus (the purpose or questions to be answered).

   The purpose of this two-phase complementary mixed method study is to assess the multivariate relationships among organizational commitment, organizational engagement and emergent leadership behavior in a local community of faith. The second phase, a social network analysis, will collect both statistical and interview data to assist in explaining how the relationships within the organization hinder or promote emergent leadership behavior.

   Looking at the affective relationship followers have with their organizations through organizational engagement, organizational commitment, and the social context of followers in the organization adds to the current followership research through emergent leadership behavior in followers.

   The following questions are used as a guide to shape the research of this study.

   1. How does a follower’s organizational commitment and organizational engagement influence the likelihood of assuming roles of informal leadership in the organization?

   2. Does emerging leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and/or organizational engagement influence the development of the organization’s social network?

   3. How do followers influence and lead each other through their social context within the organization?
3. Describe the research design including the use of a control group and any intervention or treatment to be administered to the participants, whether performed by the researchers or others.

Participants will complete a two part confidential electronic survey. The first part of the survey measures organizational commitment, organizational engagement and informal leadership behavior. Organizational commitment will be measured using the 18-item commitment scale developed for three-component model of commitment consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1993). Organizational engagement is a 17-item scale that measures enthusiasm and self-involvement with a task or collective, and maintaining a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2000). Leader emergence behavior is identified using 5 items from the Conger–kanungo Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1984). Participants are asked to rate the extent to which each of the five items is characteristic of how they see themselves participating within the organization. The second phase of this study will use the same scale and allow peer evaluation of leader emergence behavior in the social network analysis.

The second part of the survey will record and evaluate the social network structure of the organization. An electronic survey is administered to determine relationships and strength of relationships between the organizational members. The survey consists of three sections. First, the survey asks participants to identify who they know from a roster of members provided by organizational leaders, which are referred to as weak ties. The survey then asks participants to identify the strong relationships they have with other organizational members. Network measures such as centrality, homophily, density, and betweenness are calculated for each participant. These network measures will be used to determine each individual’s position in the organizational social network. Interviews will be conducted to better understand the social structure of the organization.

4. Describe your data collection procedures in detail.

What will the participants (and controls) be doing to create the data (e.g., filling out a survey, performing a task, etc.)? If the participants will need training, explain in detail. (Attach copies of any instruments, tests, surveys, interview guides, etc., and descriptions of any research data collection equipment.)

Phase One - (all surveys will include an electronic consent before participants can take the survey)
Introductory emails will be sent out from the participating organization and the researcher giving an overview of the study. An email roster of organizational member will be used to distribute the Initial organizational commitment, organizational engagement and informal leadership behavior survey (total of 40 items, all using a 7-point Likert type Scale anchored by “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree). Basic demographic data will also be collected (Age, Sex, Marital Status and Race). Identical paper copies of the survey will be made available to organizational members. If any identification markers are inadvertently collected, for example names written on paper surveys, the Identification will be removed and not included in data storage. (See Commitment survey included)

Phase Two - (all interviews will include the collection of a signed consent form)
Four initial interviews will be conducted to determine the types of relationships are most valued within the social connections between members of the organization (for example family ties, advice, trust, friendship, etc.) Two formal and two informal leaders within the organization will be asked to participate in a short 25-minute semi-structured interview (see initial interview protocol.) An additional electronic survey is administered to determine relationships and strength of relationships between the organizational members. The survey asks participants to identify who they know from a roster of members provided by organizational leaders. The survey then asks participants to identify the strong ties they have with other organizational members through the predetermined valued relationships based on the initial interviews. The last section of the relational survey asks participants to evaluate members they nominated as strong relationships using the Conger–kanungo Leadership Scale. (see Relationship survey included)

A second set of interviews will be completed to allow selected organizational members opportunity to share with the researcher and establish meaning behind the collected quantitative data collected from the electronic surveys. Five to eight organizational members will be asked to participate in a medium length interview, 45-60 minutes. The organizational members will be selected purposefully by degree centrality determined through the social network analysis. (see Interpretive interview protocol.)
RISKS AND CONFIDENTIALITY:

1. RISKS TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Will the participants be placed *at risk of harm* as a consequence of participating in this research? ☐ Yes ☑ No

*Definition of *at risk of harm*: to be placed in a position with greater potential for physical, mental, social, legal or financial harm than would be expected for that individual in his or her normal occupation or daily activities. If you are not sure of the answer to the above question, please contact the Research Compliance Officer for guidance. If the answer is YES to the above question, then this research needs to be reviewed by the full IRB.

2. CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA

Will any data be part of a permanent record that can be identified with the participants? ☐ Yes ☑ No

(if yes, explain)

What steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the data? (How will the participant’s privacy be protected?)

The electronic survey is conducted using a panel of emails. As soon as the survey collection is complete email addresses will be completely removed from the data and replaced with a randomly generated four-digit participant code. All working data and published material from this project will have all personal identification markers removed.

Where will the data be stored for the three (3) year minimum? Specify the precise location, preferably in a locked file cabinet with limited access by others, and on the UCA campus.

Data will be stored for three years on digital media at Masburn 235, on University of Central Arkansas' campus within a locked cabinet designated for collection of data for leadership research projects. After three years all media and written records connected to this study will be destroyed.
INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURES: (See the consent/cover letter/permission/assent templates.)

1. What type of informed consent will be used? (Check one or more as appropriate to your project.)
   - [ ] Informed consent agreement, parent permission, assent (signatures obtained).
   - [ ] Informed consent cover letter (no signature obtained). One of the criteria below must be met and checked off.
     - [ ] The research presents no more than minimal risk of harm and involves no procedures for which a signature is normally required outside of the research.
     - [ ] The only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent and the principal risk would be potential harm from a breach of confidentiality.
   - [ ] Waiver from informed consent process. All four criteria must be met. Describe this need in your project description.
     - [ ] The research involves no more than minimal risk to participants.
     - [ ] The waiver will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants.
     - [ ] The research could not practically be carried out without the waiver.
     - [ ] Whichever appropriate, participants will be given additional pertinent information after participation.
   - [ ] Oral consent. (Attach a copy of the script for informed consent and the short written form that will be signed by the participant and a witness.)

2. Describe clearly (step-by-step) how informed consent/permission/assent will be obtained from or presented to participants, parents, and/or legal guardians.

   *Interviewee: After introductions, consent letter will be presented and read through by the researcher with the participant, letter is signed when understood, an unsigned copy is left with participant.
   *Survey: Participants cannot enter either survey without giving electronic consent, a screen with the formal consent letter will be shown at the beginning and a pdf file will be made available for download.

3. Are you purposely withholding some information from participants or using deception in the research? [Yes] [No] (If YES, provide the following information)

   Describe the withheld information or the deception:

   Justify the reason:

   Describe the post research debriefing of the participant, including when and where participants will be debriefed:
   (Attach a copy of the debriefing statement that will be given to participants.)
ATTACHMENTS:

- questionnaire, survey, list of potential interview questions, etc. to be used with research participants
- consent agreement, cover letter, telephone introductory script
- permission to use existing data and/or permission from external institution (if applicable)
- other

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR'S ASSURANCE STATEMENT:

I understand the University of Central Arkansas' policies concerning research involving human subject research participants and I agree:

1) to comply with all IRB policies, decisions, conditions, and requirements;
2) to accept responsibility for the scientific and ethical conduct of this research study;
3) to obtain prior approval from the IRB before amending or altering the research protocol or implementing changes in the approved consent/assent form as it could change the exempt status of this research study;
4) to report to the IRB in accord with IRB policy any adverse event(s) and/or unanticipated problem(s) involving risks to participants;
5) to notify the Research Compliance Office and Sponsored Programs if external funding is received during the research study and comply with any additional regulatory requirements;
6) each individual listed as study personnel in this application possesses the necessary experience for conducting research activities in the role described for this research study.

Furthermore, by signing below, I also attest that I have appropriate facilities and resources for conducting this study.

Timothy Bullington

PI Signature

Dec 9th, 2014

Date

Co-Investigator Signature

Rhonda McClellan

Research Advisor Signature, if Student PI

Dec 17th, 2014

Date

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S ASSURANCE STATEMENT:**

This is to certify that I have reviewed this research protocol and that I attest to the scientific validity and importance of this study; to the competency of the investigator(s) to conduct the project and the time available for the project; that facilities, equipment, and personnel are adequate to conduct the research; and that continued guidance will be provided as appropriate.

Rhonda McClellan

Signature of Department Chair

Dec 17th, 2014

Date

**If the Principal Investigator is also the Chair of the department, the College Dean or Associate Dean should sign the Assurance Statement.**

Signature of Department Review Committee Chair

Date
Appendix B

Informed Consent Agreement - Interviews

University of Central Arkansas
Informed Consent Cover Letter Agreement - Interview
Followers That Lead: Relating Leadership Emergence Through Follower Commitment, Engagement, and Connectedness

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Before you give your consent to volunteer, it is important that you read the following information to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

Investigator
The primary investigator for this project is Rev. Timothy Bullington an ordained elder in the Church of the Nazarene and student at the University of Central Arkansas in the Interdisciplinary PhD in Leadership program. Dr. Rhonda McClellan will give oversight to this study and can be reached at 501.852.0910 or at rmcclellan@uca.edu. Her office is located in Mashburn Hall, Room 235 on the campus of the University of Central Arkansas.

Purpose of the Research
The purpose of this research is to determine if the combination of organizational commitment, organizational engagement, social connectedness, is related to informal leadership behavior of church members. The data from this research will be used to show how informal leadership behavior can bring about positive organizational change in both the presence and absence of formal organizational leadership, such as the pastor and employed church staff. The results of this study will be used in Timothy Bullington’s dissertation for the Interdisciplinary PhD in Leadership program at the University of Central Arkansas. Organizational commitment refers to a person’s feelings and psychological bond with their organization. Engagement describes how a person emotionally expresses themselves physically and cognitively during activities at

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study you will be asked to share your observations in a semi-structured interview. Your participation in the interview will take approximately 45 minutes. The interview is confidential and will be recorded and transcribed with all personal identifiers removed. You will be asked about the people you know and the type of relationships (family, long time friends, etc.) you have with other church members. Additionally, you will be asked to identify, describe, or give specific examples of the leadership activities of your close friends in the church. During the interview you could be asked to share when and how your close relationships in the church formed.

Potential Risks or Discomforts
There are no foreseeable risks associated with the study. Interview participation will be completely confidential.

Potential Benefits of the Research
The results of this interview will not benefit any individual but the results could give a better understanding to the impact of organizational commitment and engagement of the members a community of faith and their leadership. The aggregated results could help future planning and create a positive environment for the community of faith and participants.

Confidentiality and Data Storage
All interview data will be confidential. Individual names will be changed to pseudonyms during transcription. All interview transcripts will be stored and locked for three years in Director, PhD in Leadership Program’s Office, Mashburn Hall, Room 235. Interview digital recordings will be deleted once transcribed and coded.
Questions about the Research
If you have any questions about the research, you may contact Rev. Timothy Bullington at 501.327.7148 (office number) or pastortimbull@gmail.com. You may also contact Dr. Rhonda McClellan at 501.852.0910 or at rmcclellan@uca.edu. This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Central Arkansas.

Participation and Withdrawal
Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or stop participation at anytime without penalty. During the interview, you may choose not to answer a question or to stop the interview. To stop the interview, simply tell the interviewer you wish to stop.

Compliance Officer
This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Central Arkansas. If you have questions or concerns about the study or your rights as a participant, please contact the IRB Compliance Officer at UCA, 501.450.3451.

I have read the information provided above. I understand that by participating in this interview, I am agreeing to participate in this research study.

Please sign and date ____________________________ ____________________________

PLEASE KEEP THIS INFORMED CONSENT COVER LETTER FOR YOUR RECORDS.
Appendix C

Phase One Initial Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol: Social Network Analysis Initial Interview

Time of Interview: 
Date: 
Place: 
Interviewer: Timothy Bullington

Leadership Position of Interviewee 
(formal/informal):

Interview Description: Initial interviews are set up to determine what types of relationships are most valued within the social connections between members of the organization (for example family ties, advice, trust, friendship, etc.) Two formal and two informal leaders within the organization will be asked to participate in a short 25-minute semi-structured interview.

Review Statement of Consent and Confidentiality, and thank you for participation

Questions:

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?
2. Please list for me some of the people that you are closest to in this organization? 
  <List generation>
3. From the list of people you gave me, can you describe the relationship that you have with each person? <Go through each person they listed asking to carefully and specifically define that specific type of relationship>
4. How and when were each of these relationships formed? <Go back through the list>
5. Are there any others you would like to add to this list?

May I contact you for clarifications or follow-up questions?

Thank you for your participation in the interview, I want to remind that what you have shared with me is confidential and any potential interviews in the future will also be confidential.
Appendix D

Informed Consent Agreement - Survey

University of Central Arkansas
Informed Consent Cover Letter Agreement - Survey
Followers That Lead: Relating Leadership Emergence
Through Follower Commitment, Engagement, and Connectedness

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Before you give your consent to volunteer, it is important that you read the following information to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

Investigator
The primary investigator for this project is Rev. Timothy Bullington an ordained elder in the Church of the Nazarene and student at the University of Central Arkansas in the Interdisciplinary PhD in Leadership program. Dr. Rhonda McClellan will give oversight to this study and can be reached at 501.852.0910 or at rmcclellan@uca.edu. Her office is located in Mashburn Hall, Room 235 on the campus of the University of Central Arkansas.

Purpose of the Research
The purpose of this research is to determine if the combination of organizational commitment, organizational engagement, social connectedness, is related to informal leadership behavior of church members. The data from this research will be used to show how informal leadership behavior can bring about positive organizational change in both the presence and absence of formal organizational leadership, such as the pastor and employed church staff. The results of this study will be used in Timothy Bullington’s dissertation for the Interdisciplinary PhD in Leadership program at the University of Central Arkansas.

Procedures
We are asking you to participate in a two-part survey. The first part of the survey will ask you about basic demographic information (Education, Years you have attended at Central Arkansas, etc.) and then you will be given 40 questions addressing your commitment, engagement, and informal leadership activity at Central Arkansas. All questions will be answered on a 7 point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Organizational commitment refers to a person’s feelings and psychological bond with their organization. Engagement describes how a person emotionally expresses themselves physically and cognitively during activities at Central Arkansas.

The second part of the survey is a social network analysis where information is collected on the relationships you have with other members in the organization. You will be asked to identify all the people you know from a set list and then identify several people of which you have closer relationships (very close or good friends in the church.) From the list of close friends you selected you will be asked to evaluate each person based on trust, advice, and their understanding of the needs of you. Additionally, you will also be evaluating their leadership activities. Again, all questions will be answered on a 7 point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Your participation in the survey in the survey will take approximately 30 minutes and all responses are confidential. The survey does not have to be completed in one sitting, there will be an option to sign out and sign back in to complete the survey in an electronic format. Paper/written surveys are available.

Potential Risks or Discomforts
There are no foreseeable risks associated with the study. All participation and individual data will be completely confidential. Data will only be displayed in aggregate form.
Potential Benefits of the Research
The results of this survey will not benefit any individual but the results could give a better understanding to the impact of organizational commitment and engagement of the members at _______. The aggregated results could help future planning and create a positive environment for the community of faith and participants.

Confidentiality and Data Storage
All survey data will be confidential. All collected data will be stored and locked for three years in Director, PhD in Leadership Program's Office, Mashburn Hall, Room 235.

Questions about the Research
If you have any questions about the research, you may contact Rev. Timothy Bullington at 501.327.7148 (office number) or pastortimbull@gmail.com. You may also contact Dr. Rhonda McClellan at 501.852.0910 or at rmcclellan@uca.edu. This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Central Arkansas.

Participation and Withdrawal
Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or stop participation at anytime without penalty. To stop participation simply exit the survey if you wish to stop.

Compliance Officer
This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Central Arkansas. If you have questions or concerns about the study or your rights as a participant, please contact the IRB Compliance Officer at UCA, 501.450.3451.

I have read the information provided above. I understand that by returning a completed survey, I am agreeing to participate in this research study.

PLEASE KEEP THIS INFORMED CONSENT COVER LETTER FOR YOUR RECORDS.
Appendix E

Phase Two Survey Instrument

Consent Form Review

Part 1 – Identification and Demographics

Age:  18 to 24     25 to 44     45 to 64     65 and over

Sex:  Male     Female

Highest level of education: ________________________________

Number of years in current organization: ____________________

Number of years lived in current community: ________________

Part 2 – Survey (Commitment, Engagement, Leadership Scales)

Organizational Commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1993)

Response Scale: [1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree]

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly disagree           Strongly agree

Self-Report (Phase One Survey)

Affective Commitment Items:
1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my life at <Organization>.
2. I really feel as if <Organization>’s problems are my own.
3. *I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” at <Organization>.
4. *I do not feel “emotionally attached” to <Organization>.
5. *I do not feel like “part of the family” at <Organization>.
6. <Organization> has a great deal of personal meaning for me

Normative Commitment Items:
1. *I do not feel any obligation to remain with <Organization> in the future.
2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave
<Organization> now.
3. I would feel guilty if I left <Organization> now.
4. <Organization> deserves my loyalty.
5. I would not leave <Organization> right now because I have a sense of obligation to the church and people in it.
6. I owe a great deal to <Organization>.

Continuance Commitment Items:
1. Right now, staying with <Organization> is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave <Organization> right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided that I wanted to leave <Organization> now.
4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving <Organization>.
5. *If I had not already put so much into <Organization>, I might consider attending church elsewhere.
6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving <Organization> would be the limited options of available alternative churches I would be comfortable attending.

* Reversed Scored
Organizational Engagement and Fulfillment - Utrecht Work Engagement Scale
(Schaufeli et al., 2002)

Response Scale: [1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree]

Strongly disagree                      1  2  3  4  5  6  7                      Strongly agree

Self-Report (Phase One Survey)

VI – Vigor scale
1. When I attend <Organization>, I feel bursting with energy. (VI1)
4. When I attend <Organization>, I feel strong and vigorous. (VI2)
8. When I get up Sunday morning, I feel like going to <Organization>. (VI3)
12. I can continue working and serving for very long periods at a time at <Organization>. (VI4)
15. At <Organization>, I am very resilient, mentally (VI5)
17. At <Organization> I always persevere, even when things do not go well (VI6)

DE – Dedication scale
2. I find the work and ministry that I do at <Organization> full of meaning and purpose (DE1)
5. I am enthusiastic about <Organization>’s activities. (DE2)
7. <Organization> inspires me. (DE3)
10. I am proud of the various activities at <Organization>. (DE4)
13. To me, my service and ministry at <Organization> is challenging (DE5)

AB – Absorption scale
3. Time flies when I'm working or serving at <Organization> (AB1)
6. When I am working or serving at <Organization>, I forget everything else around me (AB2)
9. I feel happy when I am serving intensely at <Organization>. (AB3)
11. I am immersed in activities <Organization>. (AB4)
14. I get carried away when I am serving at <Organization>. (AB5)
16. It is difficult to detach myself from <Organization> (AB6)
Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994)

Response Scale: [1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

Self-Report (Phase One Survey)

1. I have vision and often bring up ideas about the possibilities for the future at <Organization>.
2. I am providing inspiring strategic and group goals at <Organization>.
3. I am consistently generating new ideas for the future of <Organization>.
4. I readily recognize new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that facilitate achievement, group goals, and objectives at <Organization>.
5. People consider me inspirational and able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what church members are doing at <Organization>.
Social Network Analysis Survey Instrument

1. Consider this list of individuals. Who do you know and whom do you feel knows you. 
   <Select names from prebuilt roster provided by Organization>

2. Consider the following list of individuals you selected. Choose between 3 and 20 
   individuals that you have a close friendship with (you can include family, friends, and 
   working relationships). You will answer a series of quick questions for each individual 
   nominate.

3. For each individual you selected from above. Please evaluate the following statements 
   about <Name>.

   I trust this person
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree                 Strongly agree

   This person energizes me
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree                 Strongly agree

   I go to this person for advice
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree                 Strongly agree

   I consider this person a personal friend
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree                 Strongly agree

   I feel this person understands the needs of <community of faith>
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   Strongly disagree                 Strongly agree
Conger–Kanungo Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994)

Leader Nominated Evaluation (Phase Two – Social Network Analysis Survey)

Response Scale: [1 = Strongly disagree; 7 = Strongly agree]

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

1. <Name> has vision and often brings up ideas about the possibilities for the future at <Organization>.
2. <Name> provides inspiring strategic and group goals at <Organization>.
3. <Name> consistently generates new ideas for the future of <Organization>.
4. <Name> readily recognizes new environmental opportunities (favorable physical and social conditions) that facilitated achievement and group objectives at <Organization>.
5. <Name> is inspirational and able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what group members are doing at <Organization>.

*<Name> - is piped data tied to leader nomination from the social network analysis survey.
Appendix F

Phase Three Interpretive Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol: Social Network Analysis Interpretive Interview

Time of Interview: Date: Place:
Interviewer: Timothy Bullington Interviewee:

Leadership Position and Degree Centrality Ranking of Interviewee:

Interview Description: After the survey data is collected, this second set of interviews will be completed to allow selected organizational members opportunity to share with the researcher the validity of the social network map and establish meaning behind the collected quantitative data created from the electronic surveys. Five to eight organizational members will be asked to participate in a medium length interview, 30-45 minutes.

Review Statement of Consent and Confidentiality, and thank you for participation

Questions:

1. Could you share with me how you became a member of this organization?
2. Could you list for me some of the people you are closest to in this organization?
   <List generation to compare to social network map created by the survey>
3. From the people you listed, who would you say are leaders in the organization?
4. How do those you have listed stand out from other organizational members?
5. Can you share with me some activities or behaviors each person you have identified has done to establish him or her as a leader?
6. Is there anything you would like to share with me about any of the people you identified in the organization?

May I contact you for clarifications or follow-up questions?
Thank you for your participation in the interview, I want to remind that what you have shared with me is confidential and any potential interviews in the future will also be confidential.