

Theses and Dissertations

2014

Leadership behavior practice patterns' relationship to employee work engagement in a nonprofit that supports the homeless

Valerie Denise Williams

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Williams, Valerie Denise, "Leadership behavior practice patterns' relationship to employee work engagement in a nonprofit that supports the homeless" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations*. 425. <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/425>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR PRACTICE PATTERNS' RELATIONSHIP TO
EMPLOYEE WORK ENGAGEMENT IN A NONPROFIT
THAT SUPPORTS THE HOMELESS

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Valerie Denise Williams

March, 2014

Leo Mallette, Ed.D. - Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation written by

Valerie Denise Williams

under the pending guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted and acceptance by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Dissertation Committee:

Leo Mallette, Ed.D., Chairperson

June Schmieder-Ramirez, Ph.D.

Andrew Harvey, Ed.D.

© Copyright by Valerie Denise Williams (2014)

All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
DEDICATION	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
VITA	xii
ABSTRACT	xiv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Leadership.....	2
Nonprofit Organizations	3
Outcomes of Employee Work Engagement in a Nonprofit.....	4
Homelessness.....	5
XYZ Homeless Shelter	9
Statement of the Problem.....	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	14
Definition of Terms	16
Assumptions	18
Timeline.....	18
Limitations of the Study	19
Summary.....	20
Chapter 2: Literature Review	22
Background and History	22
Theoretical Framework.....	23
Leadership.....	24
Instruments Used in This Study.....	28
Shelters	45
XYZ Homeless Shelter	49
Summary.....	51
Chapter 3: Methodology And Procedures.....	54
Introduction.....	54
Restatement of Research Questions.....	54

	Page
Description of the Research Methodology	55
Process for Selection of Data Sources	55
Definition of Analysis Unit	56
Data Gathering Instruments	57
Validity of Data Gathering Instruments	60
Reliability of Data Gathering Instrument	61
Data Gathering Procedures	62
Description of Proposed Data Analysis Processes	64
Sample Tables for Proposed Data Analysis.....	65
Plans for IRB	66
Summary	67
 Chapter 4: Results	 69
Table 5 Narrative	71
Table 6 Narrative	74
Table 7 Narrative	75
Table 8 Narrative	76
Key Findings.....	76
Conclusion	78
 Chapter 5: Discussion	 81
Conclusions.....	81
Recommendations.....	85
Strengths of the Study.....	90
Limitations of the Study	91
Final Summary.....	92
 REFERENCES	 94
 APPENDIX A: Leadership Practice Inventory.....	 105
APPENDIX B: Request for Permission to use the Leadership Practice Inventory Survey Instrument	107
APPENDIX C: Permission to Use the LPI Instrument.....	108
APPENDIX D: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale	109
APPENDIX E: Employee Invitation Bulletin.....	110
APPENDIX F: Employee Participant Informed Consent.....	112
APPENDIX G: IRB Approval Confirmation Notice.....	114

APPENDIX H: Participation Letter and Informed Consent for XYZ Homeless Shelter116

APPENDIX I: Letter from XYZ Homeless Shelter Granting Approval to Participate119

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Dissertation Milestone Timeline.....	19
Table 2. Demographics of the Sheltered U.S. Homeless Population.....	48
Table 3. Data Collection Schedule.....	62
Table 4. Data Analysis Scoring Interpretation.....	66
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for LPI Leadership Items Sorted by Highest Mean	72
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Employee Work Engagement Items Sorted by Highest Mean.....	74
Table 7. Psychometric Characteristics for LPI Leadership and UWES Work Engagement Scale Scores	75
Table 8. Correlations for LPI Leadership Score with UWES Work Engagement Scores	76

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1. Leadership behavior practice pattern characteristic data analysis summary sheet.....66

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother, Bonnie Ruth Martin. I could never repay you for the wonderful life I have experienced as your daughter and the support you have given me as a lifelong student. I had no idea that the ethical seeds you planted in my mental garden would shape my purpose in life as a woman, comrade, mother, and professional. Having you as a mother is priceless. No matter how big my vision was or how far I stretched outside of my comfort zone to achieve the unbelievable, you never told me I could not do it. For that reason, one of my biggest desires in life was, as still is, to always make you proud. Your unwavering love and support and listening ear have helped me make the impossible possible. This accomplishment is truly a dream come true and you have been the wind beneath my wings.

Thank you for believing in me, mom. This would never have been possible without you. Thank you for supporting one of my most desired aspirations: to become an expert at leading, educating and empowering individuals, leaders, and organizations, enhancing the way they work to boost engagement and performance results worldwide.

I did it ma...I did it! Your one and only is a Doctor! I love you so much. This one is for you, mom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

God, you are truly amazing. When I started this education journey, the scripture that fueled my confidence was and still is Philippians 4:19, “*I Can Do All Things Through Christ that Strengthens Me.*” As you know, this journey was not easy, but every time I had a bump in the road, I called on you for support, asked you to ride the wave with me, and guide me through the storm, and you were there. You have allowed me to soar during my peak seasons and gave me strength during my valley seasons, and for that I say thank you and I am grateful.

Daddy, thank you for being my biggest fan and instilling in me an entrepreneurial spirit, for the tenacity to persevere with confidence no matter what the task may be, and for supporting me in the journey even when you could not speak. May you rest in peace knowing that your job, on earth, as my father was well done. I am so grateful to you, daddy Ray, for making great contributions in my life as a wonderful parent and great example of how to love someone as your very own. Your compassion, unwavering love, support, and kindness have always made me feel larger than life.

Sir-Jonathan, Michelle, Brandon, and my grandchildren, Aileen, Sincere, Blye, and Breau, thank you for allowing me to be a mom, grandmother, sunshine, mentor, friend, example, and leader in your lives personally and professionally. It is my hope that I have been a great example of how trusting God moves mountains that appear too large to climb. It is also my hope that you will have the courage to face life’s journey with a *Mission Possible* philosophy and a commitment that embodies the principles of God’s divine word. Be grateful for your unique gifts and talents and use them to do great things. If mom can do it, you can too...I am your biggest fan! I would also like to thank Anthony W. James for his love and support. Even when there was nothing he could do, over the past 3 years he found ways to be supportive and helpful.

I would also like to thank my Chair, Dr. Leo, and my committee members and professors in this journey, Dr. June and Dr. Harvey, for their guidance, encouragement, helpful feedback, and support to help me reach such a significant milestone. Thank you to my writing coach and editor Rebekka Helford for helping me to crystallize my vision by transforming hundreds of pages of content into a more structured and meaningful study. I would also like to thank Dr. Granoff for teaching and helping me bring new knowledge to the body of leadership by helping me turn a vision of this study into meaningful and useful results.

Last but not least, to those of you (family members, friends, and colleagues) who have ever doubted your inner leadership abilities and outer excellence, may my achievement of this degree inspire you to become fully engaged in your abilities, hopes, and dreams to lead exemplary lives as leaders personal and professionally as well.

VITA

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Pepperdine University, Los Angeles, CA Doctorate of Education in Organizational Leadership	2013
University of Phoenix, Gardena, CA Masters of Arts in Organizational Management	2003
University of Phoenix, Gardena, CA Bachelor of Science in Business Management	2000
Los Angeles Southwest College, Los Angeles, CA Associate of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies	1998

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA Marshall School of Business Executive Management Development Certification	2005
California State University of Long Beach, Long Beach, CA Professional Coaching and Mentoring Certification	2004
Paralegal Training Center, Pasadena, CA Paralegal Certification	2004

PUBLICATIONS

Author: <i>POWER Your Potential Boost Camp: Seven Days to Professional Success and Satisfaction</i>	2008
---	------

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

AltaMed HealthCare Services, Commerce, CA AltaMed University, Director, Education and Training, HR	2013-present
VisionSpot Consulting, LLC, Redondo Beach, CA President and CEO	1998-present
John Sperling School of Business & Technology, Gardena, CA Adjunct Professor	2008-2010
ResMae Financial, Brea California Executive Board Administrator: Office of the Chairman, Board of Directors	2004-2007

LEADERSHIP AND AFFILIATIONS

Board of Directors National Sales Network

Former President: National Association of African Americans in Human Resources-Los Angeles

Former Board of Advisors: Circle of Change Leadership Conference

Former Board of Directors: Programs and Professional Development International Coach
Federation-Los Angeles

Member: American Society of Training and Development

Affiliation: Professionals in Human Resources Association (PIHRA)

ABSTRACT

An organization's ability to achieve its goals depends on the quality of its leaders and their ability to produce a highly engaged workforce. High levels of employee and managerial turnover and burnout can impede an organization's workforce engagement and ability to grow and be successful. To minimize the impact of these 2 constructs (turnover and burnout), this study examined the link between leadership behavior practice patterns and employee work engagement in a nonprofit that supports the homeless. Responses from 48 non-managerial employees were used for this study. To investigate this study data were collected using 2 survey instruments: the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). Both surveys were completed by the same population on the same day. The combination of cross-sectional survey designs using quantitative and descriptive correlational research methods helped the researcher analyze the data to identify relationships between the variables under investigation. According to the respondents' ratings, a positive correlation was found to exist between leaders' behavior practice patterns and employee work engagement. Moreover, the results found no negative correlations between the LPI scores and the UWES scores. High employee engagement in a nonprofit organization leads to better economic outcomes for the community and a better workplace for employees who feel their organization cares about their health and well-being, which leads to a more tenured workforce and effective group of leaders. Future directions for research include exploring other variables (leader responses and gender) to potentially predict different work engagement levels and leadership behaviors that could impede employee burnout and turnover.

Chapter 1: Introduction

High levels of employee and managerial turnover and burnout can impede nonprofit organizations' ability to grow and be successful. Burned-out workers feel exhausted and unenthusiastic, whereas engaged workers display high energy and mental resilience while working and are enthusiastic about their work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). According to Opportunity Knocks' (2011) survey poll of 30,000 people in over 300 nonprofit organizations, the average turnover rate for all nonprofits was 16%; 37% of participating organizations reported that retention is a challenge for them. For this poll, turnover was based on an organization's annual employee attrition rate. Identifying factors related to employee turnover may be the most effective means for addressing gaps between high and low levels of employee work engagement. Lupfer (2001) reports that more than 70% of leaders have no plan or strategy for increasing workplace engagement levels, even though 90% say the effects of overall workplace engagement impact business success. Whether they are for-profit or nonprofit, in order to have engaged employees, organizations need effective leaders. Nonprofit leaders and managers also need additional resources to help them to better manage burnout and engage their employees (Cornelius, Moyers, & Bell, 2011).

Employee and managerial burnout occurs in both for-profit and nonprofit organizations across industries worldwide. Leaders experience burnout when they lose their ability to influence others towards the achievement of a goal or cause. "Burnout is associated with physiological signs such as stress, fatigue and psychological symptoms such as suspicious attitudes about others" (Freudenberger, as cited in Levinson, 1996, p. 31). Leadership is about relationships (Bolman & Deal, 2003); "In times of unmitigated strain, it is particularly important for executives and managers to keep up personal interaction with their employees" (Levinson, 1996,

p. 30). A leader's actions have a fundamental influence on an employees' ability to function at the highest level of workplace engagement (Greenidge, 2010; Rogers & Meehan, 2007).

To stabilize expenditures in a volatile economic environment, nonprofit organizations must reduce the negative effects of employee turnover by developing innovative ways to keep attrition and burnout low and employee retention high, even before new hires begin working (Opportunity Knocks, 2011). To these ends, this study will help leaders in a nonprofit human services organization located in the downtown Skid Row of a large Metropolitan City minimize employee and managerial burnout by identifying ways to retain valued employees and keep them highly engaged at work.

Leadership

The ability to be an effective leader is critical in today's work environment, which is filled with frequent ambiguity and rapid change. Many researchers have described leadership as the art and science of influencing the active enrollment of others in a common vision to meet organizational goals and objectives (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 2008; Burns, 1978; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Northouse, 2010). For that reason, an organization's ability to achieve its goals depends on the quality of its leaders and their ability to produce a highly engaged workforce.

A high-quality workforce is the result of leadership behavior that demonstrates high intention and consideration for followers (employees). Conversely, a low-quality workforce occurs when leaders' behavior demonstrates low (as opposed to high) intention and consideration for their employees (Bass, 2008). Therefore, leadership is not only about the knowledge, skills, and abilities one possesses; rather, it can also be something that one does that demonstrate a leader's character in action (Lyne de Ver, 2009). Traditional theorists have studied leadership based on trying to define who leaders are, rather than what they do (O'Toole & Bennis, 1999). In

this study, the researcher presents a quantitative examination of what leaders do by identifying personal best leadership behavior practice and associated patterns of behavior related to high and low levels of employee work engagement at a nonprofit organization.

Nonprofit Organizations

Nonprofit organizations are typically designed to create a positive change to improve people's lives or enrich economic solvency in the community. Most charitable (benevolent) corporations are best known as nonprofit organizations whose sole purpose is dedicated to serving a broad public and engage in activities from which people in the community can benefit, such as social services, education, health care, religion, science, environmental protection, and the arts (Van Buren, 2004). Van Buren (2004) reports; there are approximately 1.25 million nonprofit organizations in the United States recognized by the IRS (National Center for Charitable Statistics, n.d.). However, the report does not account for nonprofit organizations that earn less than \$25,000 in annual revenue, such as some religious organizations or community networking associations that may not be required to file annual IRS forms because their annual revenue does not exceed this threshold.

Working in a nonprofit can be both a challenging and rewarding career path for leaders and their employees. Nonprofits employ over 13 million paid workers in the U.S., which represents approximately 10% of the total national workforce (Opportunity Knocks, 2011).

The key to any organization's competitive advantage, sustainability, and success lies in the actions of its leaders and high levels of workforce engagement (Fleming, 2009). Therefore, nonprofit organizations must also have managerial behavior practice patterns that are conducive to the success of their mission, facilitate accountability to their donors, and ultimately create organizational sustainability (Carver, 2006).

Every nonprofit is confronted daily with finding creative ways to develop capacities and strategies that will attract more revenue, allowing them to achieve their underlying missions to help more people. Nonprofit organizations across the nation are challenged to obtain funding sources, qualified employees, and customers, while at the same time functioning in an increasingly complex and competitive economy (Jaskyte & Kisieliene, 2006).

From 1998-2008, a 30.7% increase in the development of nonprofits produced a 39.5% increase in revenue (Wing, Roger, & Pollak, 2010). However, the 2008-2009 recessions caused financial challenges for both for-profit and nonprofit organizations alike. Although nonprofit organizations are known for providing economic opportunities and innovative services to diverse groups of people in various communities, they typically rely on fundraisers for financial stability (Wagner, 2002). Most nonprofit organizations survive and thrive using financial funding from corporate sponsors, endowments, or donor sustainability. Sustainability in a nonprofit means that it has reduced its reliance on foundation funding and strengthened its capacity to pay its own operating costs (Burd, 2009).

To increase leadership impact and reduce funding risks associated with lack of sufficient workplace engagement, nonprofit leaders must address any potential behavior practice patterns that contribute to low employee work engagement (LeClair & Page, 2007; Morrison, Burke, & Greene, 2007). Like for-profit businesses, nonprofit organizations need to carefully consider funding risks, factors that cause low worker engagement, employee turnover, and managerial burnout, all of which may impede their ability to grow and be successful.

Outcomes of Employee Work Engagement in a Nonprofit

“Nonprofit employees care about the people whom they were hired to serve. A highly engaged employee is in direct correlation with mission attainment” (Opportunity Knocks, 2011,

p.1). When employees are engaged, they are typically more satisfied, more productive, and less likely to leave the employer to seek other employment (Opportunity Knocks, 2011). High employee engagement in a nonprofit organization leads to better economic outcomes for the community and a better workplace for employees, who feel their organization cares about their well-being and growth, which leads to a more tenured workforce and energized group of leaders. More often than not, the talents and efforts of exemplary leaders and engaged workers are the driving force in meeting and exceeding goals in a nonprofit (Kouzes & Posner, 2001; Opportunity Knocks, 2011).

Homelessness

The various definitions of homelessness used in the literature fall into broad categories, enabling researchers to look at a broader population of people experiencing similar challenges despite the fact that their living situations may differ. Evidence suggests that the visibility of street beggars and those sleeping in public places has substantially changed over the past decade (Quigley, Raphael, & Smolensky, 2001) as more people are turning to the homeless shelter system for support.

The homeless population that once consisted mainly of the alcohol and substance abuse culture, mentally challenged people, the disabled, or runaways has evolved. In recent decades, the streets and shelters have seen an influx of veterans and introduction of low- and middle-class individuals who are *house cost burdened*, spending 50% or more of their income on housing due in large part to the weakened economy. Those individuals and families are now forced to deal with challenges of shelter uncertainty (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012b).

The large city in this study will hereafter be referred to as Metropolitan City in an effort to protect the confidentiality of the participating organization and its stakeholders. Metropolitan

City's Homeless Service Authority (2011) has established a common thread between shelter uncertainty and homeless categories:

- Low income families living in a shelter: household income is not above the federal poverty level for that state
- Sleeping in public places: experiencing shelter uncertainty
- Highly mobile: no permanent residence

According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness's 2012 State of Homelessness report (2012a), there are 100 large metropolitan areas in America. Most of the homeless population in the U.S. lives in large metropolitan areas in New York, California, and Florida. Among the top four metropolitan areas with the highest rate of homelessness (from highest to lowest) are Tampa, Florida; New Orleans, Louisiana; Fresno, California; and Las Vegas, Nevada. In California and Florida, the rate of homelessness is higher than the national average; these two states account for 13 of the 24 total metropolitan areas, and include 50 or more per 10,000 people in the general population considered homeless. In addition to adult families with income at or below the federal poverty line, groups with elevated risk of being homeless include:

- Mentally Impaired: "According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 20 to 25% of the homeless population in the United States suffers from some form of severe mental illness" (National Coalition of the Homeless, 2009, p. 1).
- Poor veterans: According to the 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress (as cited in National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012c), 1 in 10 people in this group the greatest risk of experience homelessness a year after discharge.

- People discharged from prison, jail or juvenile detention: The department of Justice's Bureau of Justice statistics (as cited in National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012c) report that odds of experience homelessness in this group are estimated to be 1 in 13 following their discharge.
- Emancipated youth (foster child who reach the age of 18). According to the Department of Health and Human Services (as cited in National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012c), the odds of experiencing homelessness over the course of a year in this group is estimated to be 1 in 11 following emancipation.

The term Skid Row became popular in the late 1950s, and referred to an area that provided shelter for and socialization of marginalized people in dilapidated urban metropolitan city's downtown area. The first Skid Row in the country was Yesler Way near Seattle's waterfront. The area catered to single male seasonal laborers known as lumberjacks ("Skid row," n.d.). In 1950s literature homeless people on Skid Row were referred to as *hobos*. Many transient individuals during that time participated in activities considered free-spirited and socially unusual by mainstream standards. Many of those individuals were also unmarried and chronically homeless. Today, the definition of *home* for the less fortunate may be an abandoned building, or an operational or non-operational vehicle. Storefronts, alleys, and even sidewalks serve as home to the homeless as well (R. Woods, personal communication September 30, 2012).

Contributors to homelessness include mental illness, substance abuse and addiction, and alcohol use (Quigley et al., 2001). A weakened economy has caused changes to the face of and contributing factors to homelessness. According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness (2012b), contributors to homelessness are still troubling. The national data on homelessness (2009, 2011) indicate the following:

- *Unemployment*: According to data from the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (as cited in National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2012b), the annual rate of unemployment in 2010 was 9.6%, the highest since 1983, resulting in an increase in families falling into homelessness situations.
- *Foreclosures*: Nationally, foreclosures account for 1 in 45 housing units.
- *Health Care*: Nationally, 1 out of every 6 people is uninsured.

Homelessness in metropolitan city. According to Metropolitan City's Housing Services Authority (2007), there are more than 48,000 homeless people throughout the county on any given night, many of whom traditionally congregate in the Skid Row area. "In Skid Row 31% are homeless (4,316 of 13,889) and in 2011, 17% of [Metropolitan City's] homeless population were found in Skid Row, which compares to 15% in 2009" (Metropolitan City's Housing Services Authority, 2007, p. 37).

By mid-afternoon on Skid Row in Metropolitan City, most shelters have already reached capacity for the night. The search for a place to sleep for the night becomes more desperate. Men, runaway youth, and some young women go directly to the nearest county hospital to fill the emergency room seating area until security removes them. Some check in as patients without insurance to avoid the dangers associated with sleeping on the streets, such as abuse, rape, or diseases, in addition to numerous other risks of sleeping on the dark and cold streets of Skid Row at night.

Rows of tents, sleeping bags, and sleeping bodies cover the sidewalk and side streets. The sounds of constant coughing and wheezing fill the air, accompanied by soiled bodies and the smell of urine and feces, which saturates the ground upon which the homeless sleep. The morning begins at 6:00 a.m. sharp with bullhorn broadcasts from a police car announcing that it

is time to put away tents and roll up blankets. The streets must be cleared before the stores open. To avoid being cited by the police for loitering, the elderly, women, children, and men pick up their belongings and begin moving around. The most disheartening presence on the street of Skid Row is the sense of despair and alienation. By 7:00 a.m., a multitude of people from all walks of life, educational backgrounds, and experiences will begin forming a line at the main entrance of homeless shelters in hopes of obtaining a meal and bed for the night or longer.

XYZ Homeless Shelter

The focal organization for this study was a human service organization located in a large Metropolitan City's Skid Row and referred to as *XYZ Homeless Shelter* to protect the confidentiality of the participating organization and its stakeholders. XYZ is the largest homeless shelter on Metropolitan City's Skid Row. XYZ Homeless Shelter, a nonprofit organization that was founded in 1983 based on a vision to transform lives, occupies a hotel-style residential building that houses 600 homeless men and women daily. By providing quality programs and services to the homeless women, men, and veterans, XYZ Homeless Shelter provides an opportunity to help build productive lives off the streets and hope for lasting change.

XYZ provides homeless individuals with resources to help them become more stable, earn income, and obtain secure steady housing. This well-respected organization in the human services industry impacts hundreds of people's lives daily. Without XYZ Homeless Shelter, hundreds of men and woman would remain homeless or die as a result of untreated illness or lack of access to shelter and financial resources. Accordingly, to ensure that their customers (also referred to as *participants*) have and are able to maintain a productive life, XYZ Homeless Shelter must have the backing and support of highly engaged employees, exemplary leaders and financial donors.

Every employee from the executive office to the front line staff is responsible for working closely with the homeless participants who come to the shelter. Everyone at XYZ, whether directly or indirectly, is responsible for helping participants develop individual goals and objectives and making appropriate referrals for housing, healthcare, employment opportunities, or means for family reunification.

The organization would like to enhance workforce engagement, from the executive level to line level. Recent turnover at XYZ Homeless Shelter over the past 3 years has created a culture of uncertainty, instability, and chaos, causing employees to feel confused and detached from their jobs and the mission of the organization. Sixty-three percent of voluntary turnover is, more often than not, caused by a shocking event (Branham, 2005). The same is true at XYZ Homeless Shelter. Staff attrition appeared to be an organizational norm after the resignation of the CEO and numerous other executive leaders, managers, and employees within a 1-year period. According to a national study of challenges facing nonprofit fundraising,

Executive directors at organizations where the development director position was vacant reported a median vacancy length of 6 months, with 46% reporting vacancies even longer than that. Among organizations with operating budgets of \$1 million or less, the median vacancy length jumps to 12 months. (Bell & Cornelius, 2013, p. 5)

The turnover at XYZ Homeless Shelter has created a drastic change in the overall service quality rendered to participants. The turnover and decrease in funding endowments has forced the organization to maintain its business practices with fewer resources. Turnover and lack of adequate funding resources have caused employee and management burnout from the increased workload and influx of people coming to the shelter daily.

An organization's management team cannot control turnover problems until they identify the root cause. Therefore, polling all employees to determine their thoughts about their jobs, work environment, and management serves as a valuable resource for filling the gap between high and low levels of employee work engagement, workplace stability, and organizational sustainability and growth (Opportunity Knocks, 2011) is worthwhile.

Human service nonprofit organizations such as XYZ homeless shelter are important for providing resources to improve social ills. XYZ must find ways to minimize turnover, as the effect of ongoing attrition will further its unstable environment and decrease the overall service quality rendered to XYZ's participants. If low levels of employee work engagement are not addressed at XYZ Homeless Shelter, its sustainability will also suffer (Opportunity Knocks, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

XYZ Homeless Shelter's strong brand identity, long term funding support, and employees' commitment may eventually undergo undue hardship if employee and managerial turnover and burnout are not addressed. Financial stress and scrutiny are becoming more of a norm among nonprofits. Healthy, vibrant nonprofit organizations have the potential to use their mission to raise money, which can in turn advance their mission (Hastings, 2008). Another big issue faced by businesses and nonprofits alike is not only finding, but also retaining high-quality employees (Opportunity Knocks, 2011).

Indeed, at least 75% of voluntary turnover is attributable to ineffective leadership, and one of the most effective means of reducing employee turnover is to train leaders better (Robison, 2008) and find ways to improve employee engagement in the workplace. Because "Management and leaders are closely related and usually perform both activities" (Howell &

Costley, 2006, p. 8), the targeted population in phase one and two of this study consist of non-executive or managerial employees at XYZ Homeless Shelter.

The XYZ Homeless Shelter management team must be at their personal best while at the same time creating a work atmosphere to which employees want to belong. If employee work engagement is not sufficiently high, employee turnover and burnout could jeopardize XYZ Homeless Shelter's capacity to remain financially healthy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership behavior practice patterns of one nonprofit organization's management team and their relationship to employee work engagement from the perspective of worker health and well-being, which are considered to be the opposite of burnout. Like any business, in order to succeed in the nonprofit world, XYZ Homeless Shelter needs an engaged workforce and a well-managed infrastructure to achieve its mission. Solid nonprofit infrastructures run by leaders who are able to consistently influence high levels of workforce engagement reap the benefits of having tenured employees and maximize funding resources to combat social ills (Barbeito & Bowman, 1998). Consequently, results from this study may help leaders and employees enhance the overall level of work engagement within the organization and enhance the quality of service to residents of XYZ Homeless Shelter by minimizing turnover and increasing funding.

Various studies have explored links between leadership behavior practices and workplace engagement in corporate work settings. However, there is very little information on correlations between the leadership behavior qualities measured by Kouzes and Posner's (1997) Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) among nonprofit leaders and employee work engagement.

Furthermore, few studies have explored the relationship among these qualities and employee turnover, burnout, employee work engagement, and its impact on funding endowments.

The latest research by leadership scholars and practitioners in the field of employee work engagement highlights the relevance of the role of the manager by assigning responsibility for improving employee work and well-being in the workplace (Figueroa-González, 2011; Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003; Wallace & Trinkka, 2009). However, these studies do not correlate Kouzes and Posner's (1997) LPI's five key characteristics of exemplary leadership – encouragement, vision, challenge, example setting, and action with personal feelings relative to vigor (work energy), dedication (enthusiasm about doing the work) and absorption (total happiness about work) – with high and low levels of workplace engagement. The researcher used these leadership characteristics as a basis for helping everyone in the workplace become more effective by examining leadership behavior practice patterns' relationship to levels of employee work engagement, while at the same time helping management have a more positive impact at XYZ Homeless Shelter.

Therefore, this study intended to address any potential gaps between XYZ Homeless Shelter's management team's leadership behavior practice patterns and levels of employee work engagement. The research compared the LPI results from employees at XYZ with his/her results of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale ([UWES]; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) to identify behavioral practice patterns related to the highest and lowest level of work engagement within XYZ Homeless Shelter.

The researcher used a quantitative approach to obtain data and yield findings to identify what behavior practice patterns, if any, correlated with high and low levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter. The results of this study could serve as a benchmark for

minimizing the negative impact of employee turnover and maximize funding resources to address and combat homelessness at XYZ.

Research Questions

The following two research questions were developed in an effort to achieve the goals of the study:

1. Which of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership positively correlate with the highest levels of self-perceived employee work engagement?
2. Which of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership positively correlate with the lowest levels of self-perceived employee work engagement?

Significance of the Study

Business literature contends that a business leader's first responsibility is building and maintaining an organization of highly committed employees, even before profits. People are an integral part of organizational success. In a nonprofit organization, success is not measured in dollars. Rather, it is measured by the success of the programs carried out by the employees, such as mission critical goals and objectives, number of customers helped, dollars raised, and reputation built (Lawson, n.d.). As such, management plays a significant role in shaping workplace environments that can improve or hinder employee satisfaction, influence workforce engagement, and impact business outcomes.

Historically, the majority of theoretical writings and empirical research on organizational leadership has traditionally attended to leaders' influence on the bottom line. Although profit is

associated with success, dollars are not always the primary measure of achievement. Indeed, the nonprofit organization's progress cannot be measured by looking at a profit and loss statement.

However, many nonprofit organizations struggle financially as well, even those with excellent programs, and especially those seeking to grow (Burd, 2009). Although nonprofit leaders do not have control over the economy, saving money and cutting costs should be high on their list of priorities. "One simple, (but not easy) way to save money and cut cost is by decreasing employee turnover" (Opportunity Knocks, 2011, p. 1).

Many nonprofit organizations no longer have the security of a principal group of donors that fund delivery of core services to the community year after year. The average donor patronage is typically 3 to 4 years (Schwinn & Sommerfield, 2002). Smaller and midsized nonprofits, in particular, lack access to reliable funding sources that would help them cover the full costs of providing services while at the same time building stronger organizations (Burd, 2009).

XYZ Homeless Shelter serves the needs of the community and the economy because it helps get homeless people off the streets through providing back to work programs and access to permanent housing. If XYZ's management team has more energy to drive results and employees are highly engaged, the organization can obtain further long-term funding opportunities to ensure the mission of the organization is accomplished. Additionally, findings from this research may be applicable to other nonprofit organizations of similar size and scope or those facing similar issues. Variables outlined in the limitations section of this study could be used for later quantitative research relative to workforce engagement or themes such as: high levels of work vigor, dedication and absorptions versus turnover, burnout or funding challenges in a nonprofit.

Subsequent evolutions of the data from this study could help management and employees increase their level of work engagement and output to enhance the level of service rendered to the homeless residents of XYZ Homeless Shelter. The management team at XYZ Homeless Shelter considers their employees to be valued assets, much like financial capital or brand equity, and is looking for more robust and accessible information about leadership behavior practice relevant for enhancing workforce engagement.

The study may also result in new standards and procedures for leading and leadership development within XYZ Homeless Shelter. Access to this information could help XYZ Homeless Shelter's management team better align their best leadership practices to yield higher worker engagement and funding resource availability to ensure that all stakeholders have the capacity to succeed.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions represent key terms used in this study. Relevant definitions were selected relative to leadership in association with the targeted organization for this study, and definitions are broadly used. These terms encompass the foundation of, environmental setting of, and proposed instruments for this study.

Exemplary leadership practices: Exemplary leadership practices enable individuals and groups of people to achieve organizational goals by identifying personal capacities to effectively measure competencies as a leader through processes that will allow him/her to deliver his/her personal best (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Employee work engagement: Employee work engagement describes a fulfilling work-related state of mind characterized by drive and dedication that motivates employees to perform at high levels. Engagement can be thought of as a mix of commitment, loyalty, productivity, and

ownership (Fleming, Coffman, & Harter, 2005; Little & Little, 2006; Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Roma, & Bakker, 2002).

Influence: Influence can be defined as power without exertion of force or direct command, or undue persuasions to produce effort on the part of others (Cialdini, 2006).

Leader: A leader is responsible for energizing, empowering, and building a coalition (Elster & Corral, 2009) of workers to achieve vision, strategy, and innovation (Van Gelder, 2005), while at the same time ethically solving complex problems to achieve success.

Leadership: According to Kouzes and Posner (2006), leadership is the art and science of influencing the actions of others toward the achievement of common tasks and goals.

Leadership behavior practice: Leadership behavior practices present an active display of one's leadership style by motivating employees and clearly communicating implementation plans that can be put into action easily (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939).

Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI): The LPI is a research tool used to assess leadership behavior practice patterns with a five-part survey model that categorizes leadership behavior into five action descriptors: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart. These categories translate into five behavior practices of exemplary leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Management: A manager is a person who continually plans, organizes, supervises people and processes, and controls resources to achieve organizational goals (Nebecker & Tatum, 2002).

Productivity: Productivity is a process in which an individual's work output, contribution to, or delivery of a standard/expected quantifiable measure of time and speed of production is used as a critical determinant of cost efficiency ("Labor productivity," n.d.).

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES): The UWES is a 17-question survey instrument used by researchers, leaders, and organizations to measure vigor, dedication, and absorption levels of employee engagement conditions in the workplace (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

Assumptions

The researcher assumed that a quantitative approach would be the most effective means for achieving the goals of this study to identify leadership behavior practice patterns' relationship to employee work engagement in a homeless shelter. For this reason the study, was conducted under the following further assumptions:

- Kouzes and Posner's (1997) LPI leadership instrument is a valid and reliable means to identify, isolate, compare, and define patterns of nonprofit managers' leadership behavior practices.
- The UWES (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) instrument is a valid and reliable means for identifying and measuring high and low levels of employee work engagement.
- Because the instruments in this study presents questions in a positive opposed to negative or unenthusiastic manner, the entire survey population completed the surveys with no other intentions or biases than to candidly describe leadership behavior practices used and current levels of employee work engagement.

Timeline

The timeline presented in Table 1 presents the researcher's milestones for completing the study by December 2013. The timeline served to break the dissertation process into small functional sections for better doctoral study and focus. The timeline helped the researcher's chair and committee verify that the researcher is operating on schedule.

Table 1

Dissertation Milestone Timeline

	Key Event	Due date
1.	Methodology section to dissertation chair	December 29, 2012
2.	Send Instrument permission Letter for approval	January 3, 2012
3.	Submit dissertation Proposal to the Committee	January 18, 2013
4.	Schedule dissertation proposal defense	January 18, 2013
5.	Proposal (study) defense	February 21, 2013
6.	Submit IRB application	April 5, 2013
7.	Develop participant survey packets and cover letter	April 18, 2013
8.	Confirm selected organization. Send letter to president/CEO and Vice President of Programs and Services for approval	April 19, 2013
9.	Proctor surveys/data collection phase one and two	September 27, 2013
10.	Interpretation of final methods	October 10, 2013
11.	Analysis and write study results	October 25, 2013
12.	Discussion of results and conclusions	October 28, 2013
13.	Semi-final draft to dissertation chair	November 20, 2013
14.	Final draft to dissertation committee	November 21, 2013
15.	Dissertation defense scheduled	November 21, 2013
16.	Final dissertation defense	December 10, 2013

Limitations of the Study

Although the leaders' and their employees' identity remained confidential, employees may have feared retaliation if their identity were to have become known. To ensure further anonymity in the research, the aforementioned elements (unique identifiers such as name, department or title) were not used in the study to avoid any research biases. This perceived fear of retaliation may result in untruthful responses to survey questions. Further, the researcher only studied employees that were fluent in the English language (oral and written) and did not correlate the ethnicity or gender classifications of anyone surveyed. Additionally the subjective nature of both instruments used in this study may have caused margins in the results because the measurements are subjective and not objective. Participants may have skewed their answers to

make themselves and their managers look better. The managerial responses to the surveys and pay levels or financials of the organization, current level of management performance productivity of the XYZ homeless shelter were not included in the study.

Summary

Chapter 1 summarized the present study that examined the links between leadership behavioral practice patterns and levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter, which is located in downtown Metropolitan City's Skid Row. A leader's actions have the ability to effect low levels of employee work engagement and organizational inefficiencies. The results of this study can help XYZ Homeless Shelter discover ways to draw on people's commitments and capacity to learn, grow, and be productive in order to drive and deliver their desired results (Senge, 2004). Therefore, the researcher conducted a quantitative study intended to provide XYZ's leaders with information to assess, isolate, compare, and define patterns of interrelationship between management behavior practices and employees' levels of engagement. Three areas of focus were represented in this study:

- Leadership behavior practice patterns of the nonprofit management team.
- High vs. low employee work engagement at a nonprofit.
- Outcomes of work engagement levels at a nonprofit.

Results of this study may consequently help managers and employees minimize overall employee turnover and management burnout while at the same time identifying any gaps that may exist between leader behavior and work engagement that hinder the quality of service provided to homeless shelter residents. The theoretical framework of this study is outlined in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 includes details for the methodology and procedures of this study. Chapter 4 includes a detailed explanation of the research methods data. A detailed analysis of the results

will be presented in Chapter 5, along with findings and recommendations for future study, followed by the researcher's final summary of the research findings.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Background and History

Employees' experiences with their boss affect how they think about their work as well as their level of engagement for getting the work done (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). "For most people, much of their meaning in life comes from their level of engagement in the workplace" (French, 2006, p. 7), which is fueled by the approach of and interaction/relationship with their leaders. Organizations have traditionally supported employees' development with the goal of improving the organization's financial performance (French, 2006). The theoretical framework for this study included the LPI by theorists Kouzes and Posner (1997).

Historically, the majority of theoretical writings and empirical research on organizational leadership have traditionally attended to leaders' influence on the bottom line (Leigh, 2001). In many businesses, the bottom line is business profit represented in dollars and cents, but this may not always be the most important measure of organizational success, as is the case with nonprofits. The value an organization places on the needs, attributes, and development of human capital and leadership behavior that influence workers' active work engagement is associated with the organization's revenue producing power. If employees are to be truly valued as an asset, much like financial capital or brand equity, leaders will need more robust and accessible information about current and future leadership trends. Access to this information will help leaders better align employee commitment to produce higher work engagement and ensure everyone has the resource and capacity to succeed at every level within the organization.

Leadership research throughout history has focused on effectiveness and different behavior practice patterns, attempting to draw conclusions about how a leader's behavior

correlates with employee work engagement. However, business literature is inconclusive in providing a sound basis for linking leadership behavioral practices with the highest levels of employee commitment in a nonprofit setting.

This chapter presents a review of leadership literature as it relates to disciplines, theories, and practices of leaders relative to behavior practice patterns and their relationship to employee work engagement. The study investigated the impact of management behavior characteristic practices on workplace engagement (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008) and introduced Kouzes and Posner's (1997) LPI. The LPI is designed to help further leaders' understanding of their unique leadership behavior style when they are at their personal best. There are, admittedly, many facets to leadership, and it is virtually impossible to address all of them in this study. For that reason, this study focused on leadership behavior practice patterns related to the five leadership practices outlined in the LPI instrument. The substantial differences between engaged and unengaged employees in the workplace as a topic of work and well-being have yielded growing interest amongst practitioners and researchers (Bakker et al., 2008). As such, in conjunction with the LPI survey, the researcher also used the UWES, an instrument that measures employee work engagement conditions in the workplace.

Theoretical Framework

The main theorists of this study are Kouzes and Posner (1997). Kouzes and Posner's theoretical framework on leadership characteristics served as empirical means for establishing a benchmark for exemplary management behavior practice patterns. The researcher used the behaviors to establish the groundwork for understanding each manager's practice pattern relationship to employee work engagement in a homeless shelter environment and whether employees are highly engaged. At the same time, this review helped the researcher obtain a

clearer understand as to why both management and employees at nonprofits are highly susceptible to burnout. This chapter is divided into five sections related to leaders' behavior practice patterns and their employees' work engagement factors, especially as they pertain to XYZ Homeless Shelter.

The first section contains a review of relevant literature on the history and definition of leadership. To understand a leader's influence on followers and constituents it is important to characterize and review the history of leadership, which will also provide insight into the common theories and practices of leadership. Section two defines the significant instruments and leadership behavior practice patterns in connection with factors related to effectively leading employees in a nonprofit environment. Subsections of section two explores the contrast between actively engaged employees (high engagement) compared to actively disengaged employees (low engagement) in a nonprofit organization. Section three offers insight into the nonprofit human service industry, focusing on agencies that provide resources for employment, health care, and housing to the homeless. The final section served as the conclusion for Chapter 2, offering a summary of the literature on leadership behavior styles in relationship to employee work engagement in a nonprofit human services organization that provides shelter for the homeless.

Leadership

History and context. Leadership and the study of it has roots in earlier civilizations, including Egyptian rulers, Greek heroes, biblical patriarchs, kings, emperors, and generals. However, during the historic evolution of this concept, leadership theory has shifted significantly. It is presently assumed that people identified as having authority (power) have access to the most resources within the organization. However, leadership is not just about rank

and file. According to Federman (2009), regardless of one's official position, a person does not become a leader until a group or an individual acknowledges him/her as a leader; he/she is simply a position holder until that point. Indeed, one of "the greatest source[s] of power in any organization is personal power: the character, courage, determination, knowledge, and skills of the individual members of the organization" (Nairne, 1997, p. 91).

To meet today's challenges, nonprofit executives and managers need to identify, recruit, harness, and leverage a wide range of behaviors that demonstrate their personal best as opposed to personal power. In 2001, Kouzes and Posner identified common behavior practice patterns of ordinary people when they were at their leadership best – stretching people beyond the status quo to achieve extraordinary things in for-profit and nonprofit organizations.

Although leaders are commonly required to exert their authority to motivate employees to put forth the effort necessary to attain specified results (Leigh, 2001), they are also required to evaluate and gauge employees' abilities and willingness to perform a given task (Northouse, 1997). However, Kouzes and Posner (2002) and Soltis (as cited in Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss, 2008) argue that before leaders can effectively engage and activate the power of others they must practice the art of cultivating their own strengths, standards of excellence, brand of self-efficacy, and level of engagement. Effective use of power requires being open to looking at issues and ideas from different viewpoints, thinking critically, and authentically expressing empathy, humility, and honesty.

Leadership is a privilege, and one's level of authority should not be taken for granted because of an applied classification of power relative to reporting arrangements. Therefore, a leader's ability to influence others' behavior is essential regardless of his/her function or level within the organization. Visibility developing concrete behavioral approaches that are

transferable, authentic, and customized to engage others' power creates a more committed and productive workforce.

Definitions and theories. Numerous definitions and countless of theories and literature related to the topic of leadership have been produced. Less than 30 years ago, leadership was defined as either autocratic (not including others in the decision-making process) or democratic (including others in the decision-making process, though the final decision is made by the leader). Today, leadership cannot be characterized in one precise description. In the 20th century alone, leadership has been defined and discussed in scholarly publications over 350 times (Daft, 1999; Harvey, 2004). The characteristics of 21st century leaders are neither autocratic nor democratic; rather, they are viewed as mobilizers, coaches, and influencers, rather than enforcers (Bass, 1985; Bennis, 2002; Covey & Gullledge, 1992; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Nonetheless, extensive research on various leadership styles and behaviors concurs on two key ideas; a leader has the authority to influence change and the ability to influence others toward the achievement of a goal or cause (Bass, 1985; Bennis, 2002; Covey & Gullledge, 1992; Drucker, 200; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Kristof, 1996; Nairne, 1997; Northouse, 2001). To do this, leaders must be willing and able to do the work themselves.

For this reason, this section is dedicated to exploring the body of literature related to the study of leadership and behavior styles of leaders that inspire active employee engagement. To include a review of leadership from a behavioral characteristic approach to exemplary leadership that is most adaptable to a homeless shelter setting.

Stepping into a leadership role could be difficult for leaders at XYZ Homeless Shelter, largely because although they may have experience in human service, they may be limited in terms of training, coaching, mentoring, or development in managing people and monitoring

performance through the lens of their employees (Leatt & Porter, 2003). If leaders are to be more effective within the human service environment it is important that they have the ability to respond to people's need and embrace their differences as well. Leadership traits considered important by their employees, peers, and the organization can include intelligence, persistence, extroversion, influence, self-confidence, sociability, initiative, and responsibility. Leaders should also possess people skills: the ability to work effectively with people. Rasmussen Reports LLC, a research firm for Hudson (as cited in Entrepreneur, 2006) reported that 92% of leaders say they are doing an *excellent* or *good* job managing employees, yet only 67% of workers agree. These disproportionate ratings can be attributed to leadership behaviors and actions. Researching and evaluating both leaders' behavior and their relationship to workplace engagement was vital to the significance of this study.

The philosophy, practices, and characterization of leaders have been some of the world's most established and valued skills (Leatt & Porter, 2003) because leaders are the main source of organizational effectiveness, are stewards of people's dreams, and steer the organization's vision. Senge (1990) describes leaders as the keepers of the vision whose major role is to communicate what the organization is trying to accomplish by providing clear connections to the mission to ensure it is not in danger of being lost. Everything within an organization should be centered on the mission. Effective leadership that embodies drive and enthusiasm for mobilizing people, and specific identifiable skills and behaviors related to the achievement of organizational goals drives the mission forward. Adair (1986) suggests that leaders working individually or collectively must have clearly defined purposes and goals that serve the organization.

Hitt, Ireland, Camp, and Sexton (2001) emphasize the significance of investing in the utilization of employees' knowledge skills and abilities experience higher levels of engagement.

In today's knowledge-based economy, human capital (Hitt, Biermant, Shimizu, & Kochhar, 2001) and exemplary leadership behavior practices are valuable resources in organizations of all types, helping them to achieve a more competitive advantage in the marketplace.

A lack of personal efficacy can create the feeling of not being able to achieve goals, which can lead to low self-esteem (Maslach & Leiter, 2008) and employee disengagement. Therefore organizational leaders are seen as maintaining the role of helping people become more engaged and organizations excel.

It is important that leaders understand that in most practical situations team members may have different, and at times opposing, stakes in the process and the outcomes. A disciplined workforce helps to sustain the spirit of the mission and increases the intensity and quality of work (Nairne, 1997).

A closer examination of leadership behavior practice patterns is necessary to understand their relationship to employee work engagement. Companies need high-quality leaders in order to have engaged employees (Gagnon & Michael, 2003). As such, an organization's management team influences an employee's ability to function at the highest level of engagement (Greenidge, 2010; P. Rogers & Meehan, 2007).

Instruments Used in This Study

Leadership Practice Inventory (leadership behavior practice patterns). In their book *The Leadership Challenge*, Kouzes and Posner (2002), address leadership as a quantifiable, coachable, and trainable set of behaviors. They describe five practices of exemplary leadership, which they subdivide into 10 leadership commitments. Kouzes and Posner found that when leaders were at their personal best, they were:

Practice #1: Modeling the way: Creating a standard of excellence and leading by example:

Commitment #1: Finding their voice by clearly illustrating personal values.

Commitment #2: Aligning actions with shared vision.

Practice #2: Inspiring a shared vision: Expanding their vision for the future and enrolling others in the idea:

Commitment #3: Envision the future by stimulating and elevated possibilities.

Commitment #4: Enrolling others in a shared vision and shared aspirations.

Practice # 3: Challenging the process: Taking risks and looking for innovative ways to change the status quo:

Commitment #5: Search for opportunities to be innovative, grow and improve.

Commitment #6: Try new strategies by taking risk, learning from mistakes and constantly generating small wins.

Practice # 4: Enabling others to act: Empowering personal potential to thrive by actively involving others and fostering collaboration:

Commitment #7: Fostering collaboration and building trust to advance shared goals.

Commitment #8: Strengthen other by sharing power and responsibility.

Practice # 5: Encouraging the heart: Recognizing contributions and celebrating accomplishments and recognizing individual and team contributions:

Commitment #1: Show appreciation for individual contribution and excellence.

Commitment #2: Create a spirit of community by celebrating values and accomplishments achieved.

In this study, these behaviors were measured utilizing the Kouzes and Posner's (1997) LPI. According to Kouzes and Posner (2011), "Today, ongoing empirical research continues to reaffirm that leaders who engage in the five behavioral practices outlined in this chapter are more, ambitious, effective and successful than those who do not, and are perceived by others as:

- Having a high degree of personal credibility
- Effective in meeting job-related demands
- Able to increase motivation levels
- Successful in representing the group or team to upper management
- Having a high-performance team
- Fostering loyalty and commitment
- Reducing absenteeism, turnover, and stress levels" (p. 14).

The authors of the LPI developed five descriptors for the different leadership practices and behaviors to evaluate and use the psychometric properties of the instrument to measure leadership practices. The researcher first obtained an understanding of the existing perceptions of required leadership characteristics by polling employees on leadership behaviors and his/her self on engagement levels related to by those identified behaviors at XYZ Homeless Shelter.

The following actions offers descriptors in this study that translate into behavioral characteristics aimed to frame Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five practices of exemplary leaders.

Modeling the way. Employees are constantly analyzing their leaders as models and resources for putting shared values, beliefs, and strategies into practice. In a nonprofit organization, a leader creates a standard of excellence by leading by example, because people first follow the person before they begin executing the mission or plan (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). A leader who models the way earns people's respect and gains commitment to achieve high

standards by finding his/her own voice and is able to clearly articulate his/her vision, guiding principles, and values with passion and integrity.

Today, leadership has become a multi-dimensional construct that includes not only theory but also practice. A leader that models the way make a conscious effort to ensure his/her words and actions are in consistent alignment and leads by example. Leading by example is the best way to foster higher commitment and work engagement as a leader. A leader's credibility is lost when his/her actions do not match his/her words. Employees' willingness to follow a leader will be adversely impacted if they do not believe in the messenger. Conversely, employees will not believe the message if a messenger is not clear about what he/she is trying to convey (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Inspiring a shared vision. A leader who inspires a shared vision articulates his/her dreams for the future in a manner that is so compelling that others will want to be a part of the team to make the vision become real. To be effective at enrolling others in the idea a leader must know and understand his/her people, understand what motivates them to do their very best, and have their interests at heart (Harvey, 2004).

In his book, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Steven Covey (1989), shares the power of visualization by "beginning with the end in mind (The second habit). Beginning each day, task, or project with a clear vision of the desired outcome then flex your proactive muscles to make things happen" (Covey, 1989, p. 2). Exemplary leaders in nonprofit organizations are able to create a picture of the vision and mission in followers' heads and hearts through stories, language, and meaning that ignite purpose and a sense of urgency for change. Success occurs when the vision becomes embedded into the daily actions of those being led. A successful vision tells a clear story about why the company exists and what it seeks to accomplish (Lipton, 2003).

After communicating the shared vision, the leader has to become a champion of the call to action and an executor of excellence, becoming familiar with each employee's strengths and areas of development in addition to what is important to him/her personally and professionally, while simultaneously remaining visible, consistent, and authentic. Equally important is one's ability to become an innovative, creative, and an out-of-the-box thinker, including leading by setting an example with positive energy and the highest level of integrity.

Schein (2004) states, "All group learning ultimately reflects someone's original beliefs and values, their sense of what ought to be, as distinct from what it is" (p. 28). To engage everyone throughout the organization in the task of creating and implementing new ways to achieve the organization's purpose, management must articulate a clear statement of these goals (Behn, 1995). Therefore, leaders should ensure that roles and goals are clearly communicated in a way that allows employees to see their personal contributions and shared vision for success manifested in the organization's vision.

Shared assumptions can be changed by changing the composition of the dominant groups or coalitions in an organization. Cross-segment work teams promote respect for the various disciplines in the organization, as well as greater appreciation, collaboration, output, and learning (Bass, 1985). Therefore, strong leaders who are effective at mobilizing and managing the changing needs of their employees must also be able to manage, encourage, and create solutions to support the highest level of workforce engagement in for-profit organizations and nonprofits alike. "Leadership that focuses on heightening motivation, confidence building, and inspiring belief in a cause, and employing emotional qualities to influence followers is often considered to be inspiring leaders" (French, 2006, p. 17).

Challenging the process. It is virtually impossible for someone to achieve his/her personal best without some aspect of risk or change. Almost every significant breakthrough is a result of a brave interruption of the traditional way things are typically done (Covey, 1991). Leaders who challenge the process are pioneers at stretching beyond their comfort zones to support the people, organizations, or communities they serve (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The inevitable nature of change is often uneasy to accept. However, new ideas or approaches to change become better accepted with less resistance when ideas are not forced on an individual or group (Bennis, 1999; Harvey, 2004).

On a daily basis, nonprofit leaders look for innovative ways to create a safe environment, provide resources and support, and help others willingly move past the status quo in order to change, grow and improve their lives for the better. As such, successful nonprofit leaders challenge the expected process by teaching others how to treat *inevitable mistakes* as important learning opportunities by creating a safe environment in which people can learn from failures as well as from successes. In the words of Senge (2006), it is safe for people to create and inspire a shared vision in environments where inquiry and commitment to the truth are the norm, and where challenging the status quo is expected.

Enabling others to act. Enabling others to act empowers action and mobilizes people towards achieving a goal. When a leader gives his/her power away by enlisting the support of others, he/she creates a more active and enthusiastic team. Sharing of power enables others to feel strong, capable, and more responsible for the work that they are doing, builds trust, and fosters collaboration. Leaders being willing and able to put a premium on empowering people is one of the most important standards for organizational success, as it is not what one accomplishes by oneself that is important, but what others can achieve because of the leader's

catalytic and facilitative role (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Leaders who enable others to act allow for diversity of thought, teamwork, collaboration, trust, and constructive conflict, as well as the ability to make changes and grow individually and collectively.

Nonprofit leaders are responsible for consistently mobilizing, coaching, and influencing the effective transfer of knowledge, skills, and abilities that enable people who have a stake in the vision of the organization to own their role in the process. Leaders who facilitate a sense of ownership among employees enhance dependability, create a sense of responsibility, and treat employees as appreciated assets. Kaliprasad (2006) states that, “People take ownership for their role and continuously strive to be better contributors” (p. 30) when they feel comfortable and invited to share. Therefore, it is important that leaders working in the nonprofit arena become more skilled at creating an environment of candor, where employees are open to sharing new and creative ideas and make important decisions about their work and how it gets done, and feel empowered to take ownership of their role in the process.

Encouraging the heart. Encouraging the heart is about recognizing or praising work well done and implementing various reward and recognition programs to create a more motivated team and workplace culture. According to French (2006), “Leadership that focuses on heightening motivation, confidence building, and inspiring belief in a cause, and employing emotional qualities to influence followers is often considered to be inspiring leaders” (p. 17). However, “When striving for excellence, especially in time of great change, people can become physically and emotionally exhausted, disenchanted or tempted to give up” (Kouzes & Posner, 2011, p. 6). Linking rewards systems to the achievement of goals and objectives highlights the organization’s values and creates a spirit of community, vigor, and dedication. Therefore, nonprofit leaders must come up with creative ways to recognize contributions and celebrate

accomplishments as a means for consistently creating a spirit of community and individual excellence. Recognition and positive feedback for one's contributions is uplifting, enhances employees' spirit, and accelerates action and results.

Schein (2004) states that leaders play a significant role in shaping an organization's culture. Culture is formed by shared experiences, and the leader initiates this process by encouraging the heart, celebrating accomplishments, and communicating values at the onset to produce engaged individuals and teams to yield a highly productive workforce. These practices can be applied in both for-profit and nonprofit organizations alike. More often than not in a nonprofit organization employees do not just put their loyalty in companies; they also put loyalty in people, and they associate appreciation with the level of connectivity they have with their managers and become actively disengaged and nonproductive if the connection is not strong or genuine.

Therefore, leaders must consistently display evidence of their commitment by being clear and authentic about the stories they tell, their reactions to critical issues, the language they use, the reward systems they use to recognize others, and how they spend their time in the process (Federman, 2009; Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Leaders who encourage the heart "expect the best, share the spotlight and credit for a job well done, [and celebrate] people's accomplishments in personal and meaningful ways" (Kouzes & Posner, 2001, p. 6).

Summary. As a leader, it is important to model commitment to the values of the organization. According to Kouzes and Posner (2007), exemplary leadership requires the emergence of the five key characteristics outlined in this chapter: encouragement, vision, challenge, example setting, and action. The LPI model measures leaders' demonstration of appropriate leadership behavior practices and commitments as value-added solutions to

strengthen leadership skills and provide leverage to achieve even better results and relationships with employees.

Combining the five descriptors and taking into consideration different preferences as well as different learning, communication, and behavioral practice patterns in a given situation is important for management, individual, and organizational growth. Inclusion of the five descriptors helped to ensure that all participants surveyed with this instrument had a clear understanding of their organizations management teams unique behavior practice patterns when they are at their personal best. This study is designed to help XYZ Homeless Shelter's management team identify the advantages and disadvantages of one behavior practice pattern as opposed to another.

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (employee engagement). Employee work engagement profoundly impacts occupational health psychology and organizations of all sizes and sectors across the globe. For that reason, this research used the UWES measure work engagement, a 17-question survey that evaluates employees on three dimensions – vigor, dedication, and absorption– as a way to measure levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter. The three dimensions are defined as:

- **Vigor (VI):** High levels of zest, stamina, and resilience when working, in addition to a willingness to invest effort and persistence in the face of difficulties, and not being easily fatigued.
- **Dedication (DE):** Feeling inspired about, proud of, and challenged by one's work.
- **Absorption (AB):** Being immersed in one's daily work duties and having difficulty detaching from it (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003).

Measuring employee work engagement. Measuring employee work engagement is a crucial step in building a successful for-profit or nonprofit organization. However, the real value comes in determining what creates a culture of actively engaged workers.

Contemporary researchers have begun to examine the behaviors of corporate leaders to determine the extent to which these actions correlate with employee engagement and commitment. Many companies view the biggest challenge around employee disengagement as an undesirably high rate of attrition and the additional costs associated with recruiting and training employees to replace those that choose to leave. However, in the nonprofit sector, the impact of employee engagement can become more complex. For example, a disengaged employee may choose to stay with the organization due in large part to his/her connection with the organization's mission even if he/she is not fully engaged (Accenture Consulting, Technology, and Outsourcing, 2012). Complex organizations require a constant display of committed employees, effective management, and relevant leadership (Figuroa-González, 2011).

Therefore, leaders must be change agents who inspire, measure, and monitor collective aspirations in order to yield increased engagement and productivity within the organization (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008). Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) state that work engagement is not a momentary and specific state; rather, it is a "more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual or behavior" (p. 6).

Employee engagement in a nonprofit. In a nonprofit organization, active employee work engagement does not miraculously come into existence; rather, leaders must establish the conditions to create it. Although employee work engagement may vary widely from workplace to workplace (Coffman & González-Molina, 2002), studies indicate that workers' behavior

reflect their managers' enthusiasm at work or exhaustion or burnout (Townsend & Gebhart, 2007).

Emotional exhaustion is common in the field of human services. Although employees who work in human service agencies are inclined to have a bond with the organization, the occupational class has been identified as having an above-average risk of burnout because the employees work in close proximity to the people they serve (Soderfeldt, Soderfeldt, & Wang, 1995) and overtime are more likely to become disengaged. A highly demanding work culture often leads to burnout and has a negative impact on employee work engagement, the customers, and the entire organization (Garner, Knight, & Simpson, 2007). Bullock (2011) describes the following causes of burnout:

High job demand, both emotional and workload related, contribute to the increased possibility of burnout—particularly the emotional exhaustion component (Bakker, Demerouti, de Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003; Van Vegchel, de Jong, Soderfeldt, Dormann, & Schaufeli, 2004). Examples include the experience of traumatic events on the job (Van der Ploeg, Dorresteyn, & Kleber, 2003); conflict, ambiguity, and confusion related to job role (Posig & Kickul, 2003); risk and safety factors (Leiter & Robichaud, 1997). Another factor that can contribute to burnout is being undermined by a supervisor or the belief that such behavior is occurring (Westman & Etzion, 1999; p. 24).

Nonprofit organizations with low levels of employee work engagement risk high rates of employee turnover, which can lead to employee and managerial burnout and funding challenges. The opposite of an engaged worker is a worker who is burned-out and displays a lack of vigor while at work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Burnout is inevitable without self-care, and can impede one's ability to effectively execute an organization's mission and its ability to grow

stronger over time. Towers Perrin HR Services (2003) asserts that creating an engaged workforce is a never-ending process that rests on the foundation of work experience that is meaningful and emotionally inspiring. Employee work engagement is a critical element of a satisfied and stable nonprofit workforce.

Engagement often includes the active use of emotions, enthusiasm about work, a burst of energy, and happy feelings while at work, in addition to the simple use of cognition while completing work tasks (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). The level of an employee's work engagement indicates an individual degree of commitment, level of identification with the organization, and desire for the organization to achieve its goals (Little & Little, 2006) in both for-profit and nonprofit organizations alike. Robinson, Peeryman, and Hayday (2004) conceptualize engagement as an authentic trait that contributes to employees' self-efficacy and active involvement in the mission, vision, and values of the organization, in addition to visible and consistent contributions related to the demands of the job. Therefore, having an engaged workforce in the human services field is vitally important for strengthening internal talent pools and resources (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). According to Buhler (2006), engaged workers help organizations reap benefits such as:

- Increased productivity
- Customer loyalty
- Simultaneously lower turnover

Those same benefits are also valuable in nonprofit organizations as well. Nonprofit organizations are most often supported by the guidance, encouragement, and effectiveness of high-quality company management. As such, an employee's ability to function at the highest level of engagement is influenced by the organization's management team. Therefore, leaders must

ensure that roles and goals are clearly communicated in a way that employees can see their personal contributions and vision for success manifested in the organization's vision. Although workforce engagement is a challenge faced by all organizations regardless of sector, positive influences that make a difference between a *solvent* organization and a thriving organization include: higher worker productivity and creativity on the job, higher levels of job satisfaction, and lower turnover rate (Polley, Vora, & SubbaNarasimha, 2005).

The goal of administering the UWES survey in this study is to identify high and low levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter. "Work engagement is characterized by a high level of energy and strong identification with one's work. Burnout, on the other hand, is characterized by the opposite: a low level of energy combined with poor identification with one's work" (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003, p. 5). Level of employee work engagement is divided into three primary categories:

1. Actively engaged people (productive employees)
2. Not engaged people (underutilized employees)
3. Actively disengaged people (unhappy employees; Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & , 2006; Kreisman, 2002).

According to the research, "Only 26% of the working population is fully engaged in their work. The rest of the population is either 'not engaged' (55%), or 'actively disengaged'" ([26%]; Buckingham & Coffman, 1999, p. 3).

Actively engaged employees. Actively engaged employees tend to get the least amount of focus and attention from their leaders in part because they are consistently exceeding work expectations. As such, engaged employees seldom have interaction with managers in part because they are productive and need little supervision. However, highly engaged employees

make an indelible difference in daily contributions to organizational success. Actively engaged employees “set goals, meet, and exceed expectations and charge enthusiastically toward the next tough task” (Coffman & González-Molina, 2002, p. 2). The challenge for management comes when the first signs of disengagement appear from an engaged employee. The symptoms need to be addressed immediately through better employee/manager relationships; otherwise the disconnection is likely to lower employee work commitment. Direct links between employees and their managers have the most influence over the average employee’s work experience (Opportunity Knocks, 2011).

The relationship between an employee’s behavior and work engagement has an impact on the success of an organization’s bottom line. Engaged employees are more productive (Gallup Management Journal, 2001), positively influence high performance, and generate more successful outcomes. Conversely, “Employees that are not engaged can be a serious liability” (Wilson, 2009, p. 4) and slowly erode the organization’s revenue or fundraising producing power.

In a research article assessing employee engagement, Drake (2012) compared the Job Engagement Scale and the UWES. The purpose of the comparison was to assess employee engagement, work quality deficiency, and financial risk to justify the importance of converting disengaged employees into engaged employees.

For example, in the applied arena, engaged employees have been shown to have lower rates of absenteeism (-37%), turnover (-25% to -49%), internal employee theft (-27%), safety incidents (-49%), patient safety incidents (-41%), and work quality defects (-60%) than unengaged employees (see Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & Agrawal, 2009 meta-analysis). (Drake, 2012, p. 1)

Kular et al. (2008) found that:

Employee engagement was closely linked to feelings and perceptions around being valued and involved, and that the key drivers of engagement included effective leadership, two-way communication, high levels of internal co-operation, a focus on employee development, a commitment to employee wellbeing and clear, accessible human resources policies and practices to which managers at all levels were committed. (p. 16)

However, Soltis (as cited in Kular et al., 2008) argues that before leaders can effectively engage and activate the power of others, they must practice the art of cultivating their own strengths, standards of excellence, brand of self-efficacy, and level of motivation and commitment. Leaders' motivations define the manner in which they "orient themselves toward life – not for the moment, but enduringly" (Barber, 1977, p. 8). As such, to be effective as a leader, one must be clear about one's motivation to strive for excellence, in addition to being clear about what competencies are needed to perform successfully at that level, and how the role of leader and related tasks can be enhanced to avoid burnout. It is also important to identify the individuals who need to be led or trained, consider when training should take place, and reflect on how often training should occur. To achieve an organization's mission, leaders and their employees must have a clear understanding of where maximum effort is needed and how the performance of each employee is measured and monitored. Understanding these gaps assisted the researcher identify discrepancies or differences relevant to leadership behavior practice patterns and their association with a highly engaged workforce.

Not engaged employees. Research indicates that there are more disengaged employees than engaged employees in today's organizations (Kular et al., 2008). Not engaged employees

most often *check out* emotionally and infect the organization's environment with their negativity (French, 2006; Paloutzian, Emmons, & Keortge, 2003). Employees do not just put their loyalty in companies; they also put loyalty in people, and if they do not like their bosses and do not feel appreciated (Federman, 2009; Gallup Management Journal, 2001), they become actively disengaged and nonproductive.

Not engaged employees add very little value to the organization's bottom line and can affect the solidarity of an organization's financial status as well. According to Ayers, (2006), if only 30-50% of an organization is engaged it is estimated that 50-70% of an organization's payroll is an ineffective expenditure of organizational resources. According to Gross (2009):

Upwards of 80% of workers are not bringing their best effort to the job. For example, a 2005 Conference Board survey of employees found that two-thirds of workers do not identify with or feel motivated to drive their employer's business goals; 40% of workers feel disconnected from their employers; and another 25% of employees are just "showing up to collect a paycheck". (p. 2)

Active disengagement. Actively disengaged employees are less loyal and less productive than actively engaged employees, creating a huge employee engagement and productivity gap in the workplace (Gallup Management Journal, 2001). The Gallup Management Journal (2001) reports that active disengagement costs the economy more than three billion dollars annually. Actively disengaged employees underperform on critical tasks, cause organizations large and small to incur excessive costs, and create widespread customer dissatisfaction (Rampersad, 2008). Issues faced by businesses and nonprofits alike regarding the direct cost of active disengagement include lost productivity, increased worker compensation filings, lower customer-satisfaction scores, and higher employee turnover, creating an enormous challenge for

organizational leaders (Gallup Management Journal, 2001). Turnover has inherent costs such as needing to advertising open positions; screening, interviewing and training new employees for unfilled positions; and the time it take to acclimate a new employee (Opportunity Knocks, 2011).

Actively disengaged employees cause excess cost, widespread customer dissatisfaction, and underperformance on critical tasks (Rampersad, 2006). According to research by the Integrated Benefits Institute (2004), absence-related costs alone amount to 76% of net income. Although some literature has documented different aspects of best leadership practices that correlate with high levels of employee engagement in organizations, Kular et al. (2008) argue that the root cause of a disengaged employee is poor people management. Poor people management can be measured in dollars and cents relative to labor hours lost over time, and the vast amount of time wasted on managing poor performance, actively disengaged employees, or overcoming bad hiring decisions. Increased levels of employee disengagement at work can affect the financial solidarity of an organization (Frauenheim, 2006), including endowments and sponsorships in both the for-profit and nonprofit sectors.

Summary. Employee disengagement is a growing problem in the workforce, and its effect is costly (Gallup Management Journal, 2001). A better understanding of a leader's influence on mobilizing people to work at their personal best in their day-to-day assignments reinforces value and increases the level of overall engagement in the workplace.

Work is an important part of life for many people in modern society. Work takes up much of people's time and is an essential part of human life in modern society (French, 2006) because people often spend more time at work than home (Hoffman, 2003). Therefore, organizational leaders can no longer overlook their personal behavior practice patterns or the work engagement levels of their employees because loss of talent, burnout creativity, and

enthusiasm leave gaps in the workplace that leaders must seal (French, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Mathieson & Miree, 2003). More than ever before people are looking for a fulfilling and stable work environment. This alignment is typically determined by an employee's active commitment in fulfilling his/her job duties and congruency with his/her leader. Employees who are not engaged are less productive, checked out emotionally, and more likely to leave their job or retire. "The companies that focus on their people, and create a social environment—or culture—in which employees can thrive, will achieve superior long-term business success" (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 21). Creating a highly engaged workforce in the nonprofit human/social services arena shapes the way employees approach their work and inspires high levels of productivity and performance outputs.

Shelters

Human beings require shelter for survival. Shelter is a form of security and most people who have steady streams of income pay for shelter for extended time periods: monthly rentals, annual leases, or 15 to 30 year mortgages (Hoch, 2000). In the United States, however, "The scarcity of a robust and diverse assortment of rental housing units affordable to people receiving income less than 80% of the median makes residential security is difficult to obtain" (Hoch, 2000, p. 871). A household that is unable to pay for shelter often tries to find temporary havens in the form of alternative housing, such as living with friends, relatives, other family, or even strangers.

Some landlords and homeowners have converted large homes into numerous smaller ones, often without proper inspection permits, and use them as temporary havens for family, friends, or renters (Hoch, 2000). "Such rooming arrangements combined with doubling provide the major source of non-subsidized rental housing for the poor" (Hoch, 2000, p. 871). Due in

large part to the large number of recent foreclosures, property/homeowners have abandoned property they could not afford to uphold because they were not able to appeal to potential tenants who could pay rent. Abandoned or destroyed building and houses in urban neighborhoods have been legally converted to “harbor a diverse assortment of shared accommodation: missions, flaps, and a variety of hotels” (Hoch, 2000, p. 871) serving as shelter to the poor.

These converted abandoned or destroyed buildings are used as subsidized shelters for the homeless, which are managed by nonprofit organizations and typically supported by federal housing units that are in the same city block area and are often referred to as Skid Row (Groth, 1994; Hoch & Slayton, 1989).

Instead of serving as a conduit for the social improvement of poor people, these projects (subsidized housing units) seek to build affordable residential settlements that offer a mix of rental rates for households with diverse incomes from 30% to 60% of the citywide median. (Hoch, 2000, p. 872)

Increasing the range of affordable leasing options for the homeless has become an alternative to reducing shelter uncertainty. Developers ensure that the buildings are up to code and maintenance levels, encouraging social exchange as a means of protection between neighbors and tenants (Hemmens & Hoch, 1996; Jones, Pettus, & Pyatok, 1997).

People that lack routine income are often forced into frequent shelter uncertainty because they are unable to pay rent or mortgage and are perceived as poor. “A poor individual or family who must move every few months or more loses control of the relationship between privacy and residential community” (Hoch, 2000, p. 870). Indeed, “the combination of increased shelter uncertainty and declining social capital sets the homeless apart from their housed peers” (Hoch, 2004, p. 871).

Although everyone who loses their home to foreclosure or unexpected financial crisis or evicted from their homes has an elevated risk of homelessness, homeless shelters are seldom their first choice of an alternative for shelter. Most often people experiencing housing cost burden double up with other families or friends or seek refuge in flophouses, vehicles, tent cities, or shantytowns, or become squatters.

Flophouses are inexpensive low-quality temporary boarding houses or hostels (i.e., a residential hotel that accommodates a large number of people in one room, similar to a dormitory, at a cheap rate). Although, on most metropolitan downtown districts city streets, parking for extended periods of time is illegal; in some areas the city have allocated safe parking programs for organizations (e.g., churches, and nonprofit community centers) to make parking lots available to accommodate homeless individuals and families who choose to live in their vehicles as temporary housing or long and short-term living refuges. Some homeless people resort to sleeping in tent cities or campsites of tents and fabric improvised structures versus sleeping in parks, on the ground in cardboard boxes, or in sleeping bags on the street, in public places, or in vacant lots. Shantytowns are hard structure dwellings sites. Shantytowns are built with plywood, sheathing, and other found materials, often found near industrial zones such as high transportation veins, underground tunnels rail yards, and interstates. Some individuals and families may seek refuge in unoccupied houses without permission from the owner or payment (these homeless people are called *squatters*) before seeking support from shelters. Table 2 outlines demographics of all sheltered homelessness population bases on gender, race, age household size and disabled population.

Table 2

Demographics of the Sheltered U.S. Homeless Population

	Percentage of all sheltered homeless population	Percentage of individuals	Percentage of people in families
Gender			
Male	62.3%	71.3%	22.1%
Female	37.7%	28.7%	77.9%
Race			
White, Non-Hispanic	41.6%	47.2%	31%
White, Hispanic	9.7%	8.5%	12%
Black or African American	37%	34.5%	42%
Other Single Race	4.5%	3.5%	6.4%
Multiple Races	7.2%	6.4%	8.5%
Age			
Under age 18	21.8%	1.4%	59.3%
18-30	23.5%	23.7%	23.2%
31-50	37%	48.4%	16.2%
51-61	14.9%	22.3%	1.2%
62 and older	2.8%	4.2%	0.1%
Household Size			
1 person	63%	97.2%	0%
2 people	10.1%	2.6%	24.1%
3 people	10.4%	0.2%	29.3%
4 people	8.1%	0%	22.8%
5 or more people	8.4%	0%	23.9%
Disabled Population			
Disabled (adults only)	36.8%	41.8%	15.3%

Note. Adapted from *State of Homelessness 2012: Chapter Three: The Demographics of Homelessness*, 2012, by the National Alliance to End Homelessness, retrieved from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/soh-2012-chapter-three-the-demographics-of-homelessness>. Copyright 2012 by the author.

Shelters for the homeless are typically nonprofit organizations registered as a charity. Such charitable organizations are centered on human services that support public interests or social wellbeing, such as providing relief of poverty, education, and health care. The financial sustainability of a charity is largely granted through government programs, raising of private funds through sales of goods and services, or revenue from donors or sponsors that are committed to the mission of the organization. Homeless shelters provide benefits and services to

improve an individual's standard of living. Leaders working in homeless shelters must find ways to increase their effectiveness through employees and volunteers' level of successful outcomes.

According to the Volunteers of America (2011), in 2011, more than 64,919 volunteers devoted more than 943,713 hours helping people in need by volunteering their time, spirit, and professional skills by supporting community organization such as homeless shelters. Therefore, developing best practices for decreasing employee turnover, reduce the potential for management burnout, and ensuring employees (including volunteers) are actively engaged will help further the mission of helping homeless people at XYZ stabilize their lives.

XYZ Homeless Shelter

XYZ Homeless Shelter provides various programs to combat poverty and break the cycle of homelessness. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 American Community Survey indicate that 75% of households are at or below the poverty line due to financial hardships. For many people, XYZ Homeless Shelter provides the first step for getting off the streets. All of the XYZ Homeless Shelter programs are provided under what the researcher referred to as the *Academy*, an umbrella of services that are offered daily to homeless men and women. The Academy offers homeless individuals in Metropolitan City's Skid Row area a direct link to shelter, education, and employment opportunities. Leadership and employees in this department help participants develop short-term goals and a long-term plan for self-sufficiency.

The Academy consists of six residential (in-house) programs that are tailored for homeless men and women, homeless veterans, parolees, individuals with HIV and other medical illnesses including mental illness and substance abuse issues. The internal agencies in the Academy include: Out, Street Wise Program, Employment Plus, Veterans, Medical, and Women's Palace. Each program is described briefly.

Out. Out is the second largest residential homeless program at XYZ Homeless Shelter (Tampa Bay, Florida ranks as number one). This program provides immediate housing for males and females on parole who are referred to the program by their parole officers. Employees who work in this program assist about 97 participants at a time who are unemployed, homeless, or at risk, and are willing and motivated to accept employment.

Street wise. This program helps homeless men and women get off the streets, stabilize their lives, and move forward by providing emergency shelter for up to 90 days. Employees who work in this department perform street outreach to get homeless people into the services they need and discuss resources for permanent housing.

Employment plus. This program deals with substance dependency and develops job marketability through its employment-based program, with a strong emphasis on substance abuse recovery. Employees who work in this program are responsible for addressing each person's level of sobriety and employability and then developing customized case plans.

The veterans program. This program addresses the unique challenges that veterans face, including but not limited to mental illness, physical illness, and substance abuse. Employees who work in this program helps participants find permanent housing, secure a stable income, receive intensive sociological therapy to improve social interaction among participants, and or enroll in relapse-prevention groups. XYZ Homeless Shelter's on-site Clinical Services Department focuses on issues such as trauma, domestic violence, and substance abuse and offers individual and group therapy sessions to participants.

Medical. This program offers residential medical programs to homeless individuals who are experiencing health problems and infectious diseases. Employees who work in this department help homeless people with HIV/AIDS by giving them a safe, non-stigmatized

environment to live in, counseling to deal with the diagnosis, and better access to available benefits.

Woman's Palace. This program provides women with a direct link to shelter, education, and employment opportunities to help them become empowered and lead self-sufficient lives. Employees who work in this department are responsible for facilitating a needs assessment for each participant based on physical, mental, emotional, and social services needs, as well as skills, literacy level, and substance abuse status. After participating in this program, participants' case managers make appropriate referrals, follow up to ensure delivery of services, and work on family reunification.

Summary

An organization's culture is determined by the value it places on its principles, programs, and people. Senge (2006) says that in a progressively more interconnected world, the organizations that will truly excel in the future will discover how to tap into people's commitment and capacity to learn at every level within the organization. Leaders who wish to increase effectiveness and the incentive to share knowledge should first establish a harmonious atmosphere that fosters personal commitment and engagement along with interpersonal congruence among employees (Chieh-Peng, 2007). In the past, leaders relied heavily on direct control, where coercion and compliance prevailed over consent and commitment from their employees. Gradually, the situation changed, and an increasing volume of literature on the subject of organizational leadership was introduced, reflecting a quest for a model of the ideal leader.

Sound leadership practices can offset disengagement and the negative impact of turnover, and build employee commitment and loyalty (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Seligman &

Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). As a result, the development and practice of leadership is an ongoing process (Bass, 2008).

This study focused on comparing the results of both the LPI and UWES instruments to propose a new construct of compatibility between leadership behavior practice and employee work engagement based on the subjective responses from leaders and their employees working at XYZ Homeless Shelter. Murphy (2010) asserts that the best way to foster higher employee engagement, performance, and retention an organization must develop leaders at every level within the organization by strengthening internal talent pools and provide resources sufficient for delivering the desired results.

This study expanded the current understanding of the relationship between leadership preferences and behavior patterns and employee engagement in a homeless shelter by comparing the results of the LPI and the UWES instruments. Both instruments are important for developing leadership and individual commitment and growth. Extensive research has also proven that both instruments are valid and reliable tools used in for-profit and nonprofit organizations to improve and manage engagement, and create continuity among leaders and their teams. XYZ Homeless Shelter's leaders can achieve greater results by examining their own level of engagement and burnout and use their own self-awareness and courage to drive them and their employees to success. However, effective and well-developed leaders present a strong action-oriented case for training and empowering individuals to be committed to self-development and supporting and leading organizations. Employee commitment related to performance, productivity, and innovation are essential for the success of an organization.

According to B. Rogers (2006), "top performers are four times as productive as the weakest performer" (p. 12), yet many organizations do not deal with poor-performing

employees. In order to have a high performing culture and to optimize business performance, employees must be held accountable. Rogers (2006), goes on to say, “What you measure becomes what truly matters for individuals. And once it’s important for them, it becomes important for the entire organization” (p. 12).

The word *leadership* in a work environment is synonymous with relationships. Therefore, the relationship between leaders and those who choose to follow the leader must be mutually beneficial (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). The relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow is built on the foundation of effective leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). According to Opportunity Knocks (2011), “A positive relationship with one’s direct supervisor is positively related to employee engagement” (p. 4). Leveraging differences among people and the need to develop new and better leaders are important to one’s success, organizational innovation, growth, and workforce engagement.

Therefore, developing and motivating people toward individual and collective accomplishment of organizational objectives imply a use of human capital that leaves as little as possible to chance. Leaders who take responsible measures to ensure that key personnel are actively engaged and worthy of the positions they hold deserve nothing less.

Chapter 3: Methodology And Procedures

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology used in this study. A survey format was used to collect data to evaluate and rate the perceived values of the management team's behavior practice patterns in relationship to employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter, which is located in downtown Metropolitan City's Skid Row. This quantitative study is characterized by a descriptive correlation design.

Quantitative research outcomes are intended to describe and explain the relationship between variables and the magnitude of specific phenomena in association with the influence of one variable over another (Creswell, 2005). Descriptive research is intended to explore the potential association among the variables by describing the characteristics of the populations. A quantitative, descriptive correlational design helped the researcher identify specific relationships among the variables in this study using mathematical parallels without modifying the "situation under investigation" or "detect[ing a] cause-effect relationship" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, p. 191).

The information outlined in this chapter clarifies the research questions, methodology, data sources, analysis unit, and instruments used. The process included data gathering procedures, a description of proposed data analysis processes, and a plan for protection of human subjects. The chapter concludes with a summary of the research activities in this study.

Restatement of Research Questions

This research explored the following two research questions:

1. Of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership, which practices positively correlate with the highest level of employee self-perceived work engagement?
2. Of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership, which practices positively correlate with the lowest level of employee self-perceived work engagement?

The research questions in this study led the researcher to propose the following null hypothesis:

A positive correlation exists between leadership behavior practices' influence and levels of employee work engagement.

Description of the Research Methodology

The combination of cross-sectional survey designs using quantitative and descriptive correlational research methods in this study helped the researcher identify relationships between the variables under investigation. Overall participant responses from both quantitative and descriptive correlational instruments provided the researcher with preliminary data from the population selected for this study. Although this study was not designed to determine causation, this study helped the researcher isolate, compare, and define patterns of interrelationship between managers' leadership behavior practices and employees' level of work engagement from the employees' perspectives at XYZ Homeless Shelter (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).

Process for Selection of Data Sources

The objective of this study was to focus the research exclusively on leadership behavioral characteristics and levels of employee work engagement in one organization. The first phase of this study focused on the entire management staff working at XYZ Homeless Shelter. The second phase of this study focused on the organization's non-management employees. XYZ

Homeless Shelter is a 7-day a week/24-hour a day operation that currently has approximately 90 total employees distributed across nine different business units in the Programs and Services division working in four shifts per day. According to Resolution Research (2013), based on the statistical reliability desired for an audience of 90 employees in the target audience and confidence level (95%) /interval level (+/-10) margin of error, the general respondent size recommended for this study was 47.

The executive administration office, security, maintenance, and six residential (in-house) programs are tailored for homeless women veterans, men, poor veterans, parolees, individuals with HIV, and people with substance abuse issues or mental illness.

Definition of Analysis Unit

The objective of this research was to investigate one segmented staff population that works in a nonprofit human services organization that provides support and shelter to homeless people. The organization is located in downtown Metropolitan City's Skid Row. The analysis unit was employees' ratings of management (for phase one) and employees' ratings of their own perceived levels of engagement (for phase two), both from the employee perspective.

Phase one. The population size for the first phase in this study was 90, which included frontline employees, non-management maintenance, security, and administrative staff, case managers, clinical staff, volunteers and part-time employees, all of whom were invited to participate. However, only employees that were fluent in the English language (oral and written) were included in this study. Permission for both instruments was given for English language tools and the researcher only spoke in the English language.

Phase two. The population size for the second phase in this study consisted of the same 90 participants that complete the survey in phase one, which included frontline employees, non-

management maintenance, security, and administrative staff, case managers, clinical staff, volunteers, and part-time employees that are fluent in the English language.

Data Gathering Instruments

To research the relationship between leadership behavior practices and employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter, this study employed two standardized quantitative survey instruments to measure the variables under investigation.

Leadership behavior practice patterns: Phase one instrument. The instrument used in phase one of the data collection process was the LPI, developed and written by Kouzes and Posner (1997). Although the LPI is a multi-rater survey instrument, this study used only the 30-question *Observer* survey (see Appendix A), the results of which reflect how each participant rates his/her manager's behavior practices as a leader.

According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), leadership is a “set of skills and abilities that both experienced and novice leaders can use to turn challenging opportunities into remarkable successes” (p. 4). Using this definition, Kouzes and Posner (1997) developed research tools to assess leadership behavior, such as the LPI: a five-part survey model that categorizes leaders into five action descriptors that translate into five behavior practices of exemplary leadership. These behavior practices are as follows:

- Modeling the way.
- Inspiring a shared vision.
- Challenging the process.
- Enabling others to act.
- Encouraging the heart.

All survey questions were ranked equally, and the results of the LPI were not intended to convey relative value of different leadership behavior practices. The highest-ranking LPI score in one single category was identified as the predominant leadership practice pattern of behavior that XYZ managers used the majority of the time (Kouzes & Posner, 2003) as observed by employees. For that reason, the LPI was used in phase one of this study to measure the perceived leadership behavior practice patterns of the management team at XYZ Homeless Shelter from the employees' perspective.

The LPI's questions are grouped into the aforementioned five categories based on descriptors such as, "My manager seeks out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities and talk about future trends that will influence how my work gets done" (Kouzes & Posner, 1997, p. 1). Each participant was asked to respond by ranking each descriptor on a 10-point Likert scale from 1 (Almost Never) to 10 (Almost Always). The survey was designed to measure various leadership behavior practices ranging from what a leader does to set an example of what he/she requires from employees to finding innovative ways to improve how things are done in an organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Response values for each of the five sections were totaled to yield a cumulative score; the sections with the overall highest scores represented the leadership behavior practices in which the employees believe management at XYZ engages most frequently.

In order to reproduce and distribute the instrument the researcher had to obtain official permission to use the LPI as outlined within the scope of this study. Therefore, the researcher requested express permission to use the instrument (see Appendix B). The letter included a request to use the LPI in this research study, the identity of the researcher, a narrative of the

study, and details of how the instrument will be used. Jossey-Bass granted the researcher permission to use the instrument (see Appendix C).

Employee work engagement: Phase two instrument. The instrument used in phase two of the data collection process was the UWES employee engagement survey developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002; see Appendix D), created as the opposite of the Maslach Burnout Inventory ([MBI]; Maslach et al., 1996). The goal of administering the UWES survey was to identify high and low levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter. The UWES was used to measure individual introspection relative to three related aspects of work engagement: vigor (six questions), dedication (five questions), and absorption (six questions). The UWES is free for use for non-commercial scientific research; therefore, the researcher did not need to obtain permission to use the UWES as outlined within the scope of this study (see Appendix D).

The 17-question UWES survey instrument (see Appendix D) was given to each non-manager employee to self-assess his/her personal work engagement (in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption). The survey was administered to each employee who agreed to participate at the designated time of the study. Participants rated various questions on a 7-point Likert scale (0= Never, 7= Always/Every day). These questions address their level of work engagement and burnout, including items such as:

- Vigor: “When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.”
- Dedication: “I am enthusiastic about my job.”
- Absorption: “When I am working, I forget everything else around me.” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003, p. 5)

Results yielded scores that identify overall employee engagement.

Rankings for individual questions were summed to create a total score; high scores characterized the highest level of employee engagement, whereas low scores characterized the lowest levels of employee engagement. The variables of overall employee work engagement included (EE): actively engaged (High), not engaged, or actively disengaged (Low; the instrument for measuring overall engagement levels is described in detail in this chapter). The overall ratings from the 17 questions were combined into an index to subdivide non-manager employees' level of work engagement into three primary descriptors that were used as variables to employee work engagement, as previously discussed:

- Actively-engaged employees: Productive and enthusiastically connection the organization's mission, and are passionate about their work.
- Non-engaged employees: Operate based on the status quo by not putting in extra effort and are underutilized workers.
- Actively disengaged employees: Unhappy; they spread their unhappiness to other co-workers (Buckingham & Coffman 1999; Figueroa-González, 2011; Harter et al., 2006; Henning, 2008).

Validity of Data Gathering Instruments

Both instruments outlined in phase one and two of this study have been proven valid and reliable in the United States and abroad for measuring leadership behavior practice patterns (LPI) and employee work engagement and burnout (UWES). Although the instruments are available in multiple languages, for the purpose of this study, only use the English version was used.

According to Kouzes and Posner (2001), an instrument can be considered valid “when it accurately predicts performance” (p. 6). In addition to the concepts put forward in the LPI by Kouzes and Posner (1997), relevant writings and comments from other noted authorities have

been used to explain in depth how the five practices might be viewed or embedded into practical behavior practices as well (Harvey, 2004). Additionally, the UWES demonstrates a positive work engagement state of fulfillment exemplified by vigor, dedication, and absorption; this concept has yielded evidence in the United States and abroad. The authors support use of the instrument in future research (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Both instruments have been used in for-profit and nonprofit organizations, businesses, and government agencies, and are well documented in several research studies to identify leadership behavior and employee engagement and their connection to turnover, burnout, and associated cost.

Reliability of Data Gathering Instrument

The researcher selected the two instruments in this study because of their established reputation for producing reliable statistical data. According to Kouzes and Posner (2001), “In general, an instrument is ‘reliable’ when it measures what it is supposed to measure” (p. 6). The LPI has earned empirical support for its reliability and has been administered to over 350,000 individuals worldwide. The LPI is a 360 assessment tool, representing a holistic approach to evaluating leadership that includes both self-evaluation and evaluation by others (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The UWES has earned empirical support for its reliability with over “2,313 responses the UWES is currently the most commonly used measure to assess work engagement” (Shuck, 2011, p.10). Drake (2012) states that, “although the initial focus on studying the UWES mainly looked at stress-related outcomes, it has recently been used to examine the relationship between engagement and efficacy (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007), and proactive behavior (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008)” (p. 8). Therefore, both instruments were used to help the researcher obtain reliable data to measure the variables under investigation in this study.

Data Gathering Procedures

Data were collected using both survey instruments outlined in the “Definition of Data Gathering Instruments” section of this chapter. The researcher proctored the pen-and-paper administration of both survey instruments at XYZ Homeless Shelter on a designated date and time that was arranged previously with the Vice President of Programs and Services. Surveys were administered to participants who are fluent (written and oral) in the English language and available and willing to participate at the requested time. The researcher conducted phase one (rating the management) and phase two (employee engagement self-assessment) of the research on the same day. Table 3 outlines the data collection schedule that helped the author stay on track with her dissertation timeline.

Table 3

Data Collection Schedule

Task	Due Date
1. Confirm Submit IRB application	August 19, 2013
2. Develop participant survey packets and cover letter	August 20, 2013
3. Confirm selected organization. resend letter to president/CEO and Vice President of Programs and Services for approval	August 10, 2013
4. Proctor surveys/data collection phase one and two	September 27, 2013
5. Interpretation of final methods	October 10, 2013
6. Analysis and write study results	October 25, 2013
7. Discussion of results and conclusions	October 28, 2013
8. Semi-final draft to dissertation chair	November 20, 2013
9. Final draft to dissertation committee	November 21, 2013
10. Dissertation defense scheduled	November 21, 2013
11. Final dissertation defense	December 10, 2013

In order to reproduce and distribute the instruments, the researcher had to obtain official permission to use the LPI and UWES as outlined within the scope of this study. The researcher posted an Employee Invitation Bulletin (see Appendix E) in the employee lounge to invite employees to participate in the research. The survey was facilitated and written in the English

language. Therefore, only non-executive or managerial employees that were able to read and write in the English language were invited to participate in the volunteer study at the designated date and time approved by XYZ Homeless Shelter's Vice President of Programs and Services. Although permission was granted by the Vice President of Programs and Services of XYZ Homeless Shelter, he did not participate in the study nor did he directly petition employees to participate in the study. The researcher was responsible for inviting individuals to participate in the study as stated in the Employee Invitation Bulletin. The researcher was responsible for carrying out the study. All volunteers completed two survey forms. The completion of the survey forms served as the employees' consent to participate in the study. As a result, participants did not have to specify their names, department, or position. If the participant wanted documentation of his/her consent to participate in this research, her/she was given the option to provide his/her signature in the section Option to Document Consent for Participation in the Research in the Employee Participant Informed Consent form (see Appendix F). All signed Informed Consent forms were kept separately and stapled together with participant survey responses in a packet to make sure that the documents were linked. The survey data will be kept in a private locked storage section of the researcher's office for 5 years, after which time they will be destroyed.

Prior to proctoring the surveys the researcher explained the purpose, details, voluntary nature, and confidentiality of the study using the Employee Participant Informed Consent form. The researcher also gave a brief overview of the study and the anticipated use of the results, along with participants' right to withdraw from the study at any time. To further protect the participants' identity they were not required to sign in or out, nor were they assigned numerically to a specific business unit or manager. Each instrument took approximately 10-15 minutes to

complete, but participants were given up to 30 minutes to finish. Data were collected for phase one and phase two on the same day.

If any participant chose not to participate in the survey, or if a participant as not interested in completing the survey in its entirety, he/she had the right to withdraw from the evaluation process at any point without being questioned about his/her decision. XYZ Homeless Shelter employees were not required to answer any survey questions that they chose not to answer. Unanswered questions were counted as no response. Any employees not wishing to take part in the study were told to leave the questionnaire behind. The researcher was able to obtain 48 responses for each survey.

Description of Proposed Data Analysis Processes

A one-way ANOVA analysis was conducted on the five LPI behavior practices of exemplary leaders at XYZ Homeless Shelter. Employees' UWES results were compared to the LPI results to establish if a correlation existed between leadership behavior practices and levels of employee work engagement. The results of that correlation were based on the second set of data. The second analytical data technique the researcher used was descriptive statistics to aggregate the average summary score for employee work engagement and overall rating for the engagement categories, including the mean, standard deviation, range, and percentile. Employees' perceived level of work engagement was compared to their managers' leadership behavior practices in order to address this study's research questions.

Research question one. This question dealt with identifying Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior characteristics of exemplary leadership in an attempt to discover which practices positively correlate with the highest level of self-perceived employee work

engagement, as measured by the UWES. The overall LPI ratings by employees were scored in the five key leadership behavior practice areas.

Research question two. This question dealt with identifying which of the five leadership behavior practices in the LPI positively correlate with the lowest level of employee engagement, as measured by the UWES. The overall LPI ratings by employees were scored in the five key leadership behavior practice areas.

Sample Tables for Proposed Data Analysis

The overall scores for employee engagement were transcribed directly from the UWES instrument. Predominant leadership behavior practice patterns at XYZ Homeless Shelter were characterized by the overall LPI results from all participants. The results were correlated based on leader behavior practice pattern category (LPI) in association with the independent variables of overall employee engagement (EE): actively engaged (High), not engaged, or actively disengaged (Low). Overall data from the LPI survey designated a baseline for the combined responses from all participants and were presented in a summary sheet (see Figure 1).

Employees were rating their managers' personal best exemplary leadership behavior practices on a 1-10 point scale. The distribution of scores for each practice had labels attached to them and referred to as descriptors in empirical terms, as opposed to describing one's effectiveness (e.g., poor or acceptable). The researcher assigned acronyms to each key descriptor (e.g., modeling the way: MTW). The researcher used these acronyms in Chapter 4: the statistical analysis/results section of this study. Because the mean and standard deviations for each descriptor were anticipated to vary, the response data were measured as *above or below the mean*, rather than in terms of high and low scores because of the labels attached to them.

Date:
Overall LPI Practice Most Frequently Observed:
LPI: Leadership Behavior Practice Pattern Categories:
MTW __Modeling the way
ISV __Inspiring a shared vision
CTP __Challenging the process
EOA __Enabling others to act
ETH __Encouraging the heart

Figure 1. Leadership behavior practice pattern characteristic data analysis summary sheet.

Table 4 outlines the interpretation of the employee engagement scores ranging from a minimum of 17 to a maximum of 102. The higher scores represent high levels of employee work engagement, whereas the lower scores represent low levels of employee work engagement.

Table 4

Data Analysis Scoring Interpretation

Rating Point Scale	Level of Work Engagement	UWES Score	Employee Work Engagement Descriptors
0, 1 and 2	Low	17-34	The employee is disengaged (low engagement)
3 and 4	Neutral	51-68	The employee is neither engaged nor disengaged
5 and 6	High	85-102	The employee is highly engaged

Plans for IRB

According to Pepperdine University's Institutional Review Board (IRB), researchers must adhere to certain protocols when using human subjects for dissertation studies. It is important for researchers to secure IRB approval because it protects the rights and welfare of

human subjects (see Appendix G). The survey data were and will remain stored in a locked file cabinet of the researcher's office. The survey data and results will be kept for 5 years on a password protected hard drive and secured in a private locked storage section of the researcher's office. After 5 years the survey data will be destroyed.

IRB approval was obtained prior to data collection. Following the receipt of IRB approval, participants were selected and confirmed. An invitation letter was sent to the president/CEO of XYZ Homeless Shelter, as well as XYZ Homeless Shelter's Vice President of Programs and Services (see Appendix H). The letter introduced the researcher and included a brief description of the study, relevance of this initiative, the target population, data collection process, confidential nature of the study, timeline, details of how both instruments were to be used, participants' freedom to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or liability, and how the data were to be secured and stored. It also further explained the anticipated use of the study's results and XYZ Homeless Shelter's rights as a participating organization in this study. The researcher gave every assurance that there would be no way to trace the names or any other information that could identify a specific employee during the survey or data collection or analysis phase of the study. Protecting participants' identity is an essential part of any research study and increases participation (Creswell, 2005). Therefore, research data for this study were kept confidential to safeguard the anonymity and confidentiality of all respondents.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of the research methodologies to be used in conducting this study, including a description of the quantitative descriptive correlation method that will be used. The purpose of this study was to identify to what extent, if any, leadership behavior practice patterns are related to employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter, located in

downtown Metropolitan City's Skid Row. Because this study was conducted in an organization during work hours, permission was requested from both the organization and participation was supported by an invitation sent by the Vice President of Programs and Services inviting employees to participate in this voluntary study. This study consisted of two phases using two empirically supported quantitative survey instruments to obtain data: the LPI and the UWES. In Chapter 4 the researcher presents an analysis of the data using statistics to determine the correlation coefficients between management leadership behavior at XYZ Homeless Shelter and levels of employee work engagement.

Chapter 4: Results

Chapter 4 presents the descriptive statistics used to test two research models and predictors of high levels of employee work engagement in relationship to a set of leadership behavior practice patterns. Based on the 48 responses received, this chapter contains the researcher's key findings for examining the leadership behavior practice patterns of one nonprofit organization's management team and their relationship to employee work engagement from the perspective of worker health and well-being, which was considered to be the opposite of burnout.

The respondents for the study were employees in non-managerial positions at XYZ Homeless Shelter who were fluent in the English language (oral and written). Their survey responses were used to describe and explain the relationship between the variables (leadership behavior practice patterns and employee work engagement) and the magnitude of specific phenomena in association with the influence of one variable over another. The researcher used a quantitative approach to obtain data that identified what leadership behavior practice patterns, if any, correlated with high and low levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter.

As outlined in Chapter 1 of this study, this study explored two primary research questions:

1. Which of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership positively correlate with the highest levels of self-perceived employee work engagement?

2. Which of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership positively correlate with the lowest levels of self-perceived employee work engagement?

To explore the relationship between the two primary constructs in this study, the researcher used both the LPI survey, which evaluates five exemplary leadership behavior practice patterns (modeling the way, inspiring and shared visions, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart) and the UWES survey, which evaluates three characteristics (vigor, dedication and absorption) that cultivate employee work engagement.

To guide the predictions regarding how each of the five exemplary leadership behaviors would relate to employee engagement, the researcher linked the two survey instruments comparing the results of non-executive or managerial employees at XYZ Homeless Shelter. The two standardized quantitative survey instruments were linked by employees' ratings of management (for phase one) to measure the perceived leadership behavior practice patterns of the management team at XYZ Homeless Shelter. To close the relational link between employee well-being and exemplary leadership, the employees rated their own perceived levels of engagement (for phase two) to measure individual introspection relative to the three related aspects of work engagement: vigor (six questions), dedication (five questions), and absorption (six questions). The scores were combined to measure the variables under investigation.

Data collection included the use of two English-only survey instruments. XYZ employee participants completed the UWES to rate their level of employee engagement. The research findings from the LPI survey were compared to the findings from the UWES survey. The dissertation proposal, instruments, and permission letters were approved by the IRB before the researcher began the study. Following receipt of official IRB approval, the researcher invited the

non-managerial employees at XYZ Homeless Shelter (via an Employee Bulletin) to participate in an in-person survey, proctored by the researcher on September 27, 2013.

Employee engagement information data were provided for 48 ($N = 48$) employees at XYZ Homeless Shelter. Additional leadership survey assessment data were provided for 48 ($n = 48$) of the same employees to create a combined set of data for the purposes of this study. The goal of the study was to test two research models and predictors of high levels of employee work engagement in relationship to a set of leadership behavior practice patterns.

Based on the 48 responses received the ratings they gave are presented in this study (see Tables 5-8).

Table 5 Narrative

Table 5 displays the descriptive statistics for the ratings for the 30 LPI leadership items sorted by the highest mean. These ratings were given based on a 10-point Likert scale (1 = *Almost Never* to 10 = *Almost Always*). The highest ratings were given for Item 14, “My manager treats others with dignity and respect” ($M = 8.63$), and Item 6, “My manager spends time and energy making certain that I adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed upon” ($M = 8.23$). In contrast, the lowest rated items were Item 16, “My manager asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect other people’s performance” ($M = 5.88$), and Item 28, “My manager experiments and takes risks, even when there is a chance of failure” ($M = 6.02$). Suggestions for improving the ratings in these two areas are outlined in the recommendation sections of this chapter.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for LPI Leadership Items Sorted by Highest Mean

	Leadership Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
14.	My manager treats other with dignity and respect.	8.63	2.12
6.	My manager spends time and energy making certain that I adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	8.23	2.16
1.	My manager set a personal example of what he/she expect of others.	8.10	2.37
27.	My manager speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	8.08	2.49
24.	My manager gives me a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	7.88	2.73
9.	My manager actively listens to diverse points of view.	7.81	2.66
3.	My manager seeks out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities.	7.73	2.29
4.	My manager develops cooperative relationships among the people I work with.	7.71	2.52
2.	My manager talks about future trends that will influence how my work gets done.	7.67	2.74
22.	My manager paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.	7.65	2.66
10.	My manager a point to let me know about his/her confidence in my abilities.	7.50	2.84
11.	My manager follows through on the promises and commitments that he/she makes.	7.44	2.70
29.	My manager ensures that I grow in my job by learning new skills and developing my selves.	7.42	3.00
19.	My manager supports the decisions that I make on my own.	7.42	2.88
5.	My manager praises me for a job well done.	7.33	2.89

(continued)

	Leadership Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
23.	My manager makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	7.29	2.82
21.	My manager builds consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	7.25	2.88
13.	My manager search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	7.23	2.71
30.	My manager gives the members of our team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	7.17	3.03
8.	My manager challenges me to try out new and innovative ways to do my work.	6.94	3.11
26.	My manager is clear about my philosophy of leadership.	6.83	2.98
18.	My manager asks “What can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected.	6.83	3.06
12.	My manager appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	6.81	3.07
20.	My manager publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	6.69	3.13
25.	My manager finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.	6.52	2.97
7.	My manager describes a compelling image of what my future could be like.	6.52	3.09
15.	My manager makes sure that I am creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of my projects.	6.44	3.08
17.	My manager shows me how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	6.33	3.16
28.	My manager experiments and takes risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	6.02	2.95
16.	My manager asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect other people’s performance.	5.88	3.41

Note. $N = 48$. Ratings based on 10-point scale: 1 = *Almost never* to 10 = *Almost always*.

Table 6 Narrative

Table 6 displays the descriptive statistics for the ratings for the 17 employee work engagement UWES items sorted by the highest mean. These ratings were given based on a 7-point scale (0 = *Never* to 6 = *Always*). Highest ratings were given for Item 2, “I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose” ($M = 5.48$), and Item 17, “At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well” ($M = 5.44$). In contrast, the lowest rated items were Item 16, “It is difficult to detach myself from my job” ($M = 3.29$), and Item 6, “When I am working, I forget everything else around me” ($M = 3.69$).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Employee Work Engagement Items Sorted by Highest Mean

	Engagement Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2.	I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.	5.48	0.85
17.	At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well.	5.44	0.68
10.	I am proud of the work that I do.	5.29	1.15
5.	I am enthusiastic about my job.	5.19	1.30
7.	My job inspires me.	5.08	1.44
3.	Time flies when I'm working.	5.04	1.13
11.	I am immersed in my work.	5.02	1.16
13.	To me, my job is challenging.	5.00	1.13
15.	At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.	4.96	1.29
12.	I can continue working for very long periods at a time.	4.96	0.99
4.	At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.	4.85	1.27
9.	I feel happy when I am working intensely.	4.79	1.37
8.	When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	4.69	1.48
1.	At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	4.60	1.41
14.	I get carried away when I'm working.	3.92	1.84
6.	When I am working, I forget everything else around me.	3.69	2.14
16.	It is difficult to detach myself from my job.	3.29	1.83

Note. $N = 48$. Ratings based on 7-point metric: 0 = *Never* to 6 = *Always*.

Table 7 Narrative

Table 7 displays the psychometric characteristics for the six LPI scores and the four UWES scores, which revealed a high propensity of reliability for achieving similar results if the respondents were to take the test again at a later time. With the LPI, the total score was $M = 7.24$ out of 10 possible points, whereas the total UWES score had a mean of $M = 4.78$ out of 6 possible points. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for the 10 scale scores ranged in size from $\alpha = .75$ to $\alpha = .98$, with the median sized coefficient being $\alpha = .91$ (validates that the hypothesis for the study is true), suggesting that all scale scores had acceptable levels of internal reliability (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001).

Table 7

Psychometric Characteristics for LPI Leadership and UWES Work Engagement Scale Scores

Scale Score	Number of					
	Items	M	SD	Low	High	α
LPI Model the Way ^a	6	7.29	2.13	1.00	10.00	.86
LPI Inspire a Shared Vision ^a	6	7.18	2.49	1.00	10.00	.93
LPI Challenge the Process ^a	6	7.01	2.34	1.00	10.00	.91
LPI Enable Others to Act ^a	6	7.81	2.31	1.67	10.00	.93
LPI Encourage the Heart ^a	6	6.94	2.57	1.00	10.00	.93
LPI Total Score ^a	30	7.24	2.26	1.23	10.00	.98
UWES Vigor ^b	6	4.92	0.82	2.83	6.00	.76
UWES Dedication ^b	5	5.21	0.96	1.80	6.00	.87
UWES Absorption ^b	6	4.29	1.09	1.00	6.00	.75
UWES Total Work Engagement ^b	17	4.78	0.86	1.88	6.00	.91

Note. $N = 48$. ^aRatings based on 10-point scale: 1 = *Almost never* to 10 = *Almost always*.

^bRatings based on 7-point metric: 0 = *Never* to 6 = *Always*.

Table 8 Narrative

Table 8 shows that the highest person correlations in a linear pattern exist between LPI challenge the process and UWES absorption. As a result, the 48 respondents in this study perceive their leader behavior practice pattern as challenging the process the more they were more absorbed in their work. None of the resulting 24 correlations showed a negative correlation between the two measures, thereby confirming a positive correlation between leadership behavior practices' influence and levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter.

Table 8

Correlations for LPI Leadership Score with UWES Work Engagement Scores

LPI Leadership Score	UWES Work Engagement Scores			
	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total
Model the Way	.13	.25*	.29**	.25*
Inspire a Shared Vision	.13	.20	.30**	.24*
Challenge the Process	.17	.29**	.37***	.32**
Enable Others to Act	.20	.25*	.27*	.27*
Encourage the Heart	.19	.24*	.30**	.27*
Total Score	.17	.26*	.32**	.29**

Note. $N = 48$. * $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$

Key Findings

Answering research question 1. Research question 1 asked, Which of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership positively correlate with the highest levels of self-perceived employee work engagement? To answer this question, Table 8 displays the Pearson correlations between the six LPI scores and the four UWES scores. For the resulting 24 correlations, 17 were statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level and all

showed positive relationships between the two measures. An alpha level of $p < .10$ was selected over the more common alpha level of $p < .05$ due to the small population size ($N = 48$).

According to Creswell (2005), $p < .05$ is the most commonly used reference, however, when there is a small population size, what is typically more important than the $p <$ is the size of the correlation because the alpha level measures the strength of the relationship. Therefore, due to the small population and the exploratory nature of the study, it is considered standard to raise the alpha level to $p < .10$ to ensure potential findings are not overlooked (Creswell, 2005).

Inspection of the table found the four strongest correlations to be: (a) LPI *challenge the process* score with the UWES *absorption* score ($r = .37, p < .01$); (b) LPI *challenge the process* score with the UWES *total* score ($r = .32, p < .05$); (c) LPI *inspire a shared vision* score with the UWES *absorption* score ($r = .30, p < .05$); and (d) LPI *encourage the heart* score with the UWES *absorption* score ($r = .30, p < .05$).

Analysis of the Data for Research Question 1

Analysis of the data for Research Question 1 provided by employee surveys yielded the following conclusions. Based on the results of the LPI survey, a majority of the respondents believe strongly that their managers do an exemplary job at challenging the process. Based on the correlations for LPI Leadership Score with UWES Work Engagement Scores, it is assumed that one being absorbed in his/her work is a positive contrast to burnout.

Lastly, LPI survey responses showed highly favorable reactions to XYZ leaders being effective at treating others with dignity and respect and spending time and energy making certain they adhere to agreed-upon principles and standards. Respondents felt their managers are effective at implementing various reward and recognition programs to create a more motivated team and workplace culture. Even though respondents who said their managers encourage the

heart showed the lowest percentage ranking, overall the respondents appeared appreciative of their leaders.

Links between the three UWES characteristics (vigor, dedication, and absorption) showed a high correlation between absorption and the LPI behavior practice patterns of challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, and encourage the heart. These links showed a strong connection.

Answering research question 2. Research question 2 asked, Which of Kouzes and Posner's (1997) five common behavior practices of exemplary leadership positively correlate with employee work engagement? To answer this question, Table 8 displays the relevant Pearson correlations between the five LPI scores and the four UWES scores.

The findings in this study produced statistical significance for the hypothesis. The combination of cross-sectional survey designs using quantitative and descriptive correlational research methods in this study helped the researcher identify relationships between the variables under investigation.

Analysis of the Data for Research Question 2

Analysis of the data for Research Question 2 enabled the researcher to confirm that a positive correlation between leadership behavior practices' influence and levels of employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter. None of the resulting 24 correlations showed a negative correlation between the two measures.

Conclusion

This study examined the leadership behavior practice patterns of one nonprofit organization's management team and their relationship to employee work engagement from the perspective of worker health and well-being based on ratings given by 48 employees. According

to Jain, Giga, and Cooper (2009) “Organizations are living organisms whose health and well-being are measured by employee satisfaction and low level of employee satisfaction” (p. 74). As such, leaders must present leadership behavior patterns that show strong links to high workforce engagement where employees find meaning in their work, the mission, and work longevity and have a healthy relationship with their leaders.

Employees. High levels of employee engagement do not come into existence miraculously; leaders who establish the necessary conditions create it. This is best achieved by developing an employee-centered culture and learning environment that ensures leaders and employees have the skills they need to meet organizational objectives by creating a sustainable organization. Senge (2006) asserts that in a progressively more interconnected world, “the organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people’s commitment and capacity to learn at all levels” (p. 4).

Leaders. Leaders must co-create with their employees the fundamentals of how to interact with one another and build inclusion in order to influence followership and the organization’s culture. A study by Guthridge, Komm, and Lawson (2008) noted that talent is more important than strategy, capital, or research and development, making the task of recruiting, engaging, and retaining excellent employees an organizational imperative.

Non-profit organizations. Non-profit organizations that invest in innovative programs, such as leadership development, offer managers the opportunity to acquire knowledge of challenging issues, theories, and practical applications of leadership or often more effective at achieving strategic goals to gain market position and viability in the long-term (Pace, 2010). This construct reinforces the fact that work engagement is associated with high levels of well-being, whereas burnout is associated with low levels of well-being.

The employee engagement survey has the potential to uncover the greatest areas of organizational risk. In Chapter 5, this study's findings are compared to the literature, conclusions and implications are drawn, and a series of recommendations are suggested.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Chapter 5 is divided into five sections. Conclusions for this study are presented in section one, along with recommendations grouped together by research question in section two. In section three the researcher will present strengths. Limitations of the study are discussed in section four, followed by a final summary of the overall study in section five.

Conclusions

As mentioned in Chapter 4, inspection of the data found the four strongest correlations to be: (a) LPI *challenge the process* score with the UWES *absorption score* ($r = .37, p < .01$); (b) LPI *challenge the process* score with the UWES *total score* ($r = .32, p < .05$); (c) LPI *inspire a shared vision* score with the UWES *absorption score* ($r = .30, p < .05$); and (d) LPI *encourage the heart* score with the UWES *absorption score* ($r = .30, p < .05$). Kouzes and Posner (2002) characterize leaders who challenge the process as effective at finding ways to create a safe environment, providing resources and support, and helping others willingly move past the status quo. According to the respondents, at XYZ Homeless Shelter their managers test their skills at experimenting and taking risks in order to mobilize change, inspire personal growth, and improve client participants' lives for the better.

The majority of the respondents also felt their managers are effective at articulating their dreams for the future by *inspiring a shared vision* in a manner that is so compelling that others want to be a part of the team to realize the dream. The results also found that survey respondents felt roles and goals are clearly communicated by leaders, *encouraging the heart* in a way that allows employees to see their personal contributions and shared vision for success manifested in XYZ Homeless Shelter's vision.

Responses consistently indicated that employees felt a strong attachment to the work they are doing, which correlate clearly in a linear pattern with UWES absorption as shown in Table 8. Although the three leadership behaviors outlined in Chapter 3 (challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, and encourage the heart) results contribute to a person's inability to detach himself/herself from his/her work, to some respondents, absorption may mean the level of importance of his/her work well-being as compared to other areas of his/her life (e.g., the level of intrinsic motivation or significant, value, time and attention one places on one's career, title job satisfaction and commitment versus other areas in one's life).

Although the respondents rated absorption as their highest level of work engagement, the results also revealed elements of vigor in their work habits as well. Absorption is often associated with involvement, energy, and efficacy, which are the opposite of Maslach et al.'s (1996) three dimensions of burnout; burnout is considered to be an erosion of engagement. Maslach et al. argue that "Energy turns into exhaustion, involvement turns into cynicism, and efficacy turns into ineffectiveness" (p. 24).

Vigor in this study represents the respondents' willingness to invest effort and persistence when working, even when faced with difficulties. Results also revealed lower levels of dedication (inspiration, pride, and satisfaction) than absorption. However, respondents' satisfaction level has the potential to increase as a result of participating in training focused on employee well-being.

If no intervention is implemented, XYZ Homeless Shelter employees will most likely continue to feel satisfied with their work and current management team. Burnout and turnover will continue to be areas of great concern if employees do not balance work absorption with work life-balance. Employees will most likely still rank vigor and dedication lowest on their

engagement scales. A leader's interaction and understanding of how employees define their work engagement will remain positive, but imbalanced without additional leadership and employee training. Without additional training interventions, managers will likely continue to impact work engagement as a reasonably stable phenomenon associated with work absorption and organizational endowments support from donor may remain the same or become stagnant at best.

Additionally, if they do not change, XYZ leaders will continue using the same pattern of behavior that has worked optimally for them in the past and employees will continue working for the Homeless Shelter and being absorbed in their work. XYZ will continue hiring leaders and employees who are driven by the mission of the Homeless Shelter and show dedication as a result of hard work and their ability to work with others. Over time, the new incumbents may adopt the demeanor of the current employees and become immersed in their daily duties, with the potential of demonstrating moderate to high work burnout and potentially leaving the organization.

Burnout can be observed in two opposing views of a continuum within and outside the context of human interaction. For example, responses to burnout can be interpreted as a feeling of exhaustion as measured by fatigue because one is absorbed in one's work. In contrast, responses to burnout can be interpreted as indifferent attitudes towards one's work (feeling undervalued and overworked), which leads to an actively disengaged (unhappy) and nonproductive employee. Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) found that burnout was commonly described as a mental weariness relative to one's interactions with other people. However, it was later found that burnout also exists outside the context of human interaction. Schaufeli and Bakker referenced the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach et al., 1986) as an example of three dimensions reflected in the MBI-General Survey:

The first dimension—exhaustion—measures fatigue without referring to other people as the source of one’s tiredness. The second dimension—cynicism—reflects indifference or a distant attitude towards work in general, not necessarily with other people. Finally, professional efficacy encompasses both social and non-social aspects of occupational accomplishments. (Schaufeli, Leiter, Maslach, & Jackson, 1996, p. 294)

This creates an opposing view of a continuum of work absorption, suggesting that burnout and engagement should be measured individually, and considered polar opposites in their relationship to vigor, dedication, and absorption engagement scales as opposed to efficacy, cynicism, and exhaustion. Without a change in XYZ leaders’ ability to mobilize people as a positive antithesis to work engagement burnout, the Homeless Shelter may become stagnant and employees may experience the negative impact of burnout.

According to the respondents, XYZ managers appear to be highly influential. However, without some type of targeted intervention for minimizing the potential risk of burnout, employees who engage too much of themselves in their work can break down due to exhaustion, fatigue, and stress. Because one’s job cannot fulfill every need, the impact of burnout can lead to turnover, absenteeism, lack of accountability, and unhealthy patterns in other areas of the employee’s life (e.g., missing special events or not spending quality time with a significant other, family members, or friends, which could have an impact on an employee’s happiness and well-being). An employee who is overly engaged in his/her work may be successful at getting the work done, but unsuccessful in developing and maintaining healthy relationships internally and externally. Because of his/her inability to create an effective work-life balance regimen, an employee who appears highly engaged may become stressed. An employee can potentially become unhealthy because he/she is not receiving adequate rest, exercise, or a healthy diet, all of

which could lead to unhappiness, health issues, days off work, decline in service to XYZ's client participants, an unexpected resignation or reassignment of duties, and disconnection from leadership, peers, society, and current events.

Recommendations

XYZ should take a moment to acknowledge work well done in the eyes of its employees. For example, XYZ managers can create a poster to display results of this study in their offices and within the department as a display of their continuous leadership commitment to being consistent in their approach and willingness to raise the bar, ensuring high levels of continuity and transparency with their employees.

The researcher also recommends that XYZ leaders use this information as an opportunity to develop required core competencies for managers at XYZ Homeless Shelter, utilizing the three most effective leadership behavior practice patterns (challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, and encourage the heart) as the Homeless Shelter's standard for leadership effectiveness and high levels of employee work engagement. Another recommendation includes adding these standards of exemplary leadership behavior practice patterns to XYZ's new-hire orientation and employee on the job training process, making the most common practice of exemplary leadership found in this study a cultural norm. For example, the three leadership behavior practice patterns most successfully used at XYZ Homeless Shelter (as outlined previously) and their definitions could be included in XYZ's new hire orientation and on the job training process for new managerial incumbents. Additionally, newly hired non-manager incumbents can also be informed regarding what to expect from their management team. After that point, all managers would participate in a more targeted intervention including leadership training on exemplary leadership practices to deepen their understanding, expectations, and value of the behaviors.

Last, but not least, XYZ Homeless Shelter should also implement an Employee Wellness Training program including the topic of work-life balance to minimize the risk of burnout (stress) and turnover. The Wellness Program should provide resources that help employees lead healthier lifestyles personally and professionally, as building healthy communities starts with a healthy staff.

XYZ leaders have the opportunity to improve employee work engagement by learning ways to help their employees detach from their jobs by creating a more work-life balance approach to their work. This intervention can be best achieved by identifying and minimizing contributing factors to burnout, which could potentially lead to turnover.

The Wellness Program for employees can provide tips, tools, and best practices to help employees manage their health, time, talent, and company resources better, as well as live healthier lifestyles. Based on the respondents' results, implementation of a Wellness Program can help employees create a more balanced, healthy, and productive way of working that is relevant, duplicable, and sustainable over time. Such a program would help employees accomplish daily tasks without becoming overly carried away with their work.

Implementation of a Wellness Program could also serve as a vehicle for helping employees better understand the importance of enrolling fully in XYZ Homeless Shelter's mission by living the shelter's values for their client participants, while at the same time better leveraging the strengths of other co-workers to balance work output, increase social interaction, and decrease stress. Stress can be defined as the quality of one's coping skills minus the size of the problem (T. Granoff, personal communication, October 23, 2013). Therefore, building resilience to stress is vital for enhancing work well-being and minimizing burnout, which contributes to higher and healthier work engagement.

Leadership has become a multi-dimensional construct that includes not only theory but also practice. As such, once the XYZ leaders have deepened their learning through training in the top three areas of exemplary leaders practiced most effectively, they should seek out training opportunities to continue raising the bar by emphasizing strengths and capabilities in the areas respondents rated lowest on the LPI survey. The two areas ranked lowest were *model the way* and *enabling others to act*. However, both behaviors can be strengthened through practice and should be incorporated into the work-life balance training program outlined in recommendations for Research Question 1.

Model the way. Modeling the way training should include theory and several practical application exercises, such as a 180 or 360 Leadership Capstone program and evaluation tools. The Capstone program should consist of competency and skills refresher training, a 30-90 day assessment that outlines tools and techniques the leader has implemented as a result of the training, and an evaluation from subordinates, bosses, and peers using Dr. Tom Granoff's Leadership Make Over (T. Granoff, personal communication, October 23, 2013) questions:

1. What are some ways that I can do this behavior 1% better this week?
2. Who is excellent at this behavior that I can use as a role model?
3. Who lacks this skill that I can use as a warning or negative example?
4. Who in the organization would say that I do this behavior well? Why?
5. Who in the organization would say that I do this behavior poorly? Why?
6. Who could provide me with coaching if I asked them to do it?
7. What books or other training could I do to improve my skills in this behavior?

The Capstone report would include a presentation of specific outcomes, success stories, and lessons learned from each manager and responses to the aforementioned questions. This process

will allow for sharing of best practices to create a leadership culture of consistent behavior practice patterns and transparency.

The recommended Leadership Capstone Program and assessment are valuable because they help leaders identify current areas of strengths and opportunities for development. The practical application requirements associated with the assessment also give employees an opportunity to analyze their leaders as models and resources for creating and demonstrating how to balance work and personal life while at the same time putting shared values, beliefs, and strategies into practice. Implementation of the Leadership Capstone Program will give managers the opportunity to ask for and receive feedback on how their actions affect other people's performance while experimenting and taking risks, even when there is a chance of failure, which were the two areas rated lowest in the overall responses to the LPI survey. Leading by example is the best way to foster better work-life balance to decrease burnout, improve work engagement, and mobilize others towards action.

Enabling others to act. To consistently promote the mission of XYZ Homeless Shelter, organizational leaders must be effective at empowering action. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the XYZ leaders incorporate *enabling others to act* behavior into the Wellness Program as a way to mobilize people towards achieving their goals. Additionally, this behavior can be included in the work-life balance training program to help employees harness and leverage a wide range of talent that encourages their personal best as opposed to personal power. Incorporating both topics can help leaders to lead by example and master the art of sharing power by enabling others to feel strong, capable, and more responsible for the work that they are doing, as well as building trust and fostering collaboration to enhance employee work engagement.

Last, but not least, the final recommendation would be to include Kirkpatrick's (1994) Four-level (reaction, learning, behavior and results) Training Evaluation Model to all training programs. For example, after the completion of the new hire orientation, Capstone Leadership Program, and the Employee Wellness Program each employee would complete the level 1 evaluation *reaction*, which evaluates the facilitator and the overall training experience, in addition to the level 2 evaluation, *learning*, to measure the incumbents' increase in knowledge as a result of the training. The level 3 evaluations would commence 30-60 days following the training. Each leader, his/her employees, and boss would assess changes in *behavior* based on the use of tools and techniques implemented as a result of the training. The following list offers examples of questions to measure behavior change:

1. As a result of my (New Hire Orientation, Employee Wellness Program, or Leadership Capstone Program) training, which behavioral tools or techniques did I implement back on the job?
2. What has been the most notable change as a result of using these new tools and/or techniques?
3. What parts of this behavior do I already do well?
4. When is it easiest and most difficult for me to do this behavior well?
5. Are there any barriers in and around me that limit my effectiveness in doing this?

The level 4 evaluation can be facilitated during the employees' performance evaluation process, which measures behaviors and outcomes determined to be good for the employee and the organization's bottom line, as it is designed to measure results.

In summary, incorporating the two aforementioned leadership behavior practice patterns into leadership training and employee wellness programs offers value-added solutions to

strengthen leadership behavior practice patterns and provides leverage to achieve even better results and relationships with employees. These recommendations can contribute to better leadership, improved work-life balance for all employees, and higher levels of work engagement that do not leave employees from the executive level to line level feeling burned out.

Managerial and employee trainings suggested in this chapter will likely increase employee work engagement, minimize burnout, and increase retention at every level within XYZ Homeless Shelter. Training is most effective when tailored to the participants' needs and the needs of the organization. Assessment tools are useful resources for identifying current areas of strength and opportunities for development. To be effective, training program assessments and participant evaluations must be incorporated into the curriculum to deepen the learning, change behavior, and implement suggested improvements to heighten the level of overall employee work engagement.

Strengths of the Study

The strengths of this research study include valid and reliable research instruments that have been used in numerous empirical studies. Sound methodology was used to collect data to evaluate and rate the perceived values of the management team's behavior practice patterns in relationship to employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter. Although every company has its unique challenges relative to worker well-being and leadership effectiveness, the methodologies used in this study can be replicated in other homeless shelters using the same instruments and hypothesis (comparable or different) to benchmark positive leadership practice patterns and areas of improvement.

The quantitative research included two survey instruments: the LPI (leadership survey) and UWES (employee engagement survey). Both instruments consist of a quantitative,

descriptive correlational design to help the researcher identify specific relationships among the variables. The researcher used these survey instruments to examine leadership behavior practice patterns' relationship to employee work engagement at XYZ Homeless Shelter to minimize employee burnout and increase worker health and well-being and overall employee retention.

The study may also result in new standards and procedures for leading and leadership development within the XYZ organization. Access to this information could help the XYZ management team better align their leadership practices to yield higher worker engagement and funding resource availability to ensure that all stakeholders have the capacity to succeed.

Limitations of the Study

This section identifies three limitations of this study: population size, language, and gender. The primary limitation of the study was the small population size. The final population consisted of 48 participants. The Homeless Shelter has approximately 90 employees working in the Programs and Services department. This number also includes employees who do not write or speak English, who were not included in this study. The researcher received permission to use instruments that were written in the English language only; therefore, employees that could not read or write in the English language were not included in the invitation to participate. Managers and executives were also excluded from taking the survey as well.

Participating employees were asked to take two surveys. One survey asked the participants to answer 30 English language questions about leadership behavior practice patterns at the XYZ Homeless Shelter. Afterwards, the same participant employees were asked to answer 17 English language questions about their self-perceived engagement in the workplace. The study could have been strengthened by include all employees, not just those employees fluent in the English language (oral and written) and inviting XYZ's managerial team. Thereby giving all

XYZ employees an opportunity to complete both surveys and compared the results of the managers with the results of all their employees.

Therefore, future research could examine the same research questions and hypotheses using responses from the management team on the existing framework to gain a broader understanding of the interrelationship between burnout and leadership self-perceived behavior practice patterns' and overall employee work engagement compared to their employees' perceptions of the same behaviors.

Future studies should also examine correlations between gender classifications of the leader in comparison to the employees to determine to what extent, if any, gender influences employee work engagement. Few studies have compared leadership behavior practice patterns and gender of an organizational management team's impact on employee engagement and productivity in the non-profit social service arena specific to one organization located in the heart of a metropolitan city's Skid Row. As is the case with XYZ Homeless Shelter, 90% of the executive leadership team is male and the same is true of most organizations. In the nonprofit sector, only 15 women were included in *The 2003 Nonprofit Times' Power & Influence Top 50*, leaving men with 70% of the power and influence in the nonprofit sector (Van Buren, 2004). Gender appears to be so entwined in the process of self-assertion, performance, and influence (Ridgeway, 2001) that it becomes challenging to clarify how and why leadership styles and gender biases can impede or enhance employee work engagement and productivity results among followers in the nonprofit human and social services arena.

Final Summary

An organization's ability to achieve its goals depends on the quality of its leaders and their ability to produce a highly engaged workforce. High levels of employee and managerial

turnover and burnout can impede an organization's workforce engagement and ability to grow and be successful. To minimize the impact of these two constructs (turnover and burnout), this study examined the link between leadership behavior practice patterns' and employee work engagement in a nonprofit that supports the homeless. Responses from 48 non-managerial employees were used for this study. To investigate this study, data were collected using two survey instruments: the LPI and UWES. Both surveys were completed by the same population on the same day. The combination of cross-sectional survey designs using quantitative and descriptive correlational research methods was used to help the researcher analyze the data to identify relationships between the variables under investigation. Although this study was not designed to determine causation, the findings helped the researcher isolate, compare, and define patterns of interrelationship between managers' leadership behavior practices and employees' level of work engagement from the employees' perspective at XYZ Homeless Shelter (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Based on the findings, the researcher was able to conclude that a positive correlation exists between leadership behavior practices' influence and levels of employee work engagement.

Identifying and mastering exemplary leadership behavior practice patterns to address employee work engagement may enable organizations to decrease burnout and improve retention, which will ultimately enhance the quality of life for both employees and the homeless population they were hired to serve. Further exploration of leaders' relationship to employee well-being at work is recommended. An organization that seeks to mobilize the health and well-being of people within its community must begin by enhancing the health and well-being of its employees.

REFERENCES

- Accenture Consulting, Technology, and Outsourcing. (2012). *Increasing employee engagement in the nonprofit sector*. Retrieved from <http://www.accenture.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/PDF/Accenture-Increased-Employee-Engagement-Online-View.pdf>
- Adair, J. (1986). *Effective teambuilding*. Gower, UK: Aldershot.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire, sample set manual, forms, and scoring key*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Ayers, K. E. (2006). *Engagement is not enough*. Retrieved from http://lsiltd.com/pdfs/EngagementIsNotEnough_4.pdf
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187-200. doi:10.1080/02678370802393649
- Barbeito, C. L., & Bowman, J. P. (1998). *Nonprofit compensation and benefits practices*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Barber, J. (1977). *The presidential character*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. (2008). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Behn, R. (1995). Creating an innovative organization: Ten hints for involving frontline workers. *State and Local Government Review*, 27(3), 221-234. Retrieved from http://govleaders.org/behn_innovation.htm.
- Bell, J., & Cornelius M. (2013). *Underdeveloped: A national study of challenges facing nonprofit fundraising*. Retrieved from http://www.compasspoint.org/sites/default/files/images/UnderDeveloped_CompassPoint_HaasJrFund_January%202013.pdf
- Bennis, W. (1999). *Managing people is like herding cats*. Provo, UH: Executive Excellence.
- Bennis, W. (2002). The leadership advantage. In H. Hesselbein & R. Johnston (Eds.), *On mission and leadership: A leader to leader guide* (pp. 7-18). New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 hidden reasons employees leave*. New York, NY: AMACOM.

- Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Buhler, P. (2006). Engaging the workforce: A critical initiative for all organizations. *SuperVision*, 67(9), 18-20. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bah&AN=22234557&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Bullock, B. A. (2011). *An examination of the relationship between burnout and employee engagement of information technology professionals at a hospitality company* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 908920738)
- Burd, N. (2009). *On the money: The key financial challenges facing nonprofits today and how grant makers can help*. Retrieved from http://www.philanthropynw.org/s_pnw/bin.asp?CID=13221&DID=30189&DOC=FILE.PDF
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Carver, J. (2006). *Boards that make a difference: A new design for leadership in nonprofit and public organizations* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cialdini, R. (2006). *Influence: The psychology of persuasion*. New York, NY: Collins Business Essentials.
- Coffman, C., & González-Molina, G. (2002). *Follow this path: How the world's greatest organizations drive growth by unleashing human potential*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Cornelius, M., Moyers, R., & Bell, J. (2011). *Daring to lead 2011: A national study of nonprofit executive leadership*. San Francisco, CA: CompassPoint Nonprofit Services and the Meyer Foundation.
- Covey, S. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Covey, S. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Fireside.
- Covey, S. R., & Gullede, K.A. (1992). Principle-centered leadership. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 15(4), 70-79. Retrieved from <http://bryongaskin.net/education/Quality%20Management/mission-vision-principles%20bu%20Stephen%20Covey.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Daft, R. (1999). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.

- Drake, T. J. (2012). *Assessing employee engagement: A comparison of the Job Engagement Scale and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (Master's thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 1516919)
- Drucker, P. F. (2001). *The essential Drucker: The best of sixty years of Peter Drucker's essential writings on management*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Elster, R., & Corral, T. (2009). Leaders forging values-based change: Partnership power for the 21st century. *Beliefs & Values*, 1(1), 31-44. Retrieved from <http://bav.ibavi.org/index.php/beliefs-and-values/article/view/126>
- Entrepreneur. (2006). *Human resources statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.entrepreneur.com/article/81978>
- Federman, B. (2009). *Employee engagement: A roadmap for creating profits, optimizing performance, and increasing loyalty*. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Figuroa-González, J. (2011). *Managers' leadership styles and employee engagement: Quantifying managers' influence* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 3460632)
- Fleming, J. (2009). From Gallup: Why engagement is essential. *Strategic Communication Management*, 12(4), 7. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb5797/is_200906/ai_n32333830/
- Fleming, J., Coffman, C., & Harter, J. (2005). Manage your human Sigma. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(7), 106-115.
- Frauenheim, E. (2006). Study: Workers are disengaged but staying put. *Workforce Management*, 85(22), 6. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=23309231&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- French, M. L. (2006). *The alignment between personal meaning and organizational mission among music executives: A study of happiness, job satisfaction, and responsibility toward employees* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 304908738)
- Gagnon, M. A., & Michael, J. H. (2003). Employee strategic alignment at a wood manufacturer. *Forrest Products Journal*, 53(10), 24-29. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=11191362&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Gallup Management Journal. (2001, March). *Gallup study indicates actively disengaged workers cost U.S. hundreds of billions each year*. Retrieved from <http://gmj.gallup.com/content/466/gallup-study-indicates-actively-disengaged-workers-cost-us-hundreds.aspx>

- Garner, B. R., Knight, K., & Simpson, D. D. (2007). Burnout among corrections based drug treatment staff. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(5), 510-522. doi:10.1177/0306624X06298708
- Greenidge, S. (2010). *Leadership communication, culture and employee engagement: A correlation study*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 3455548)
- Gross, R. (2009). *Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Making the connection* [White paper]. Retrieved from http://www.mandrake.ca/bill/images/corporate_responsibility_white_paper.pdf
- Groth, P. (1994). *Living downtown*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Guthridge, M., Komm, A.B., & Lawson, E. (2008). Making talent a strategic priority. *The McKinsey Quarterly*, 2008(1), 48-59. Retrieved from <http://links.emeraldinsight.com/ref/37AJ033>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship with business outcomes. In C. L. Keyes, & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: The positive person and the good life* (pp. 205-224). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10594-009
- Harter, J., Schmidt, F., Killham, E., & Asplund, J. (2006). *Q12 meta-analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Gallup.
- Harvey, A. (2004). *A study of the leadership behaviors of law enforcement official*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 305033877)
- Hastings, D. F. (2008). *Managers as leaders in a non-profit organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 304816388)
- Hemmens, G., & Hoch, C. (1996) Shared housing in low income households. In G. Hemmens, C. Hoch, & J. Carp (Eds.), *Under one roof* (pp. 17-32). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Henning, J. (2008). *Break away from paradigm blindness*. Retrieved from http://talentmgt.com/articles/view/break_away_from_paradigm_blindness/print:
- Hitt, M. A., Biermant, L., Shimizu, K., & Kochhar, R. (2001) Direct and moderating efforts of human capital strategy and performance service firms: A resources-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 13-28. doi:10.2307/3069334
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M., & Sexton, D. L. (2001). Strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 479-491. doi:10.1002/smj.196

- Hoch, C. (2000). Sheltering the homeless in the US: Social improvement and the continuum of care. *Housing Studies*, 15(6), 865-876. doi:10.1080/ 02673030020002582
- Hoch, C., & Slayton, R. (1989) *New homeless and old: Community and the skid row hotel*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Hoffman, A. J. (2003). Reconciling professional and personal value systems: the spiritually motivated manager an organizational entrepreneur. In R.A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp.193-208). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Howell, J. P., & Costley, D. L. (2006). *Understanding behaviors for effective leadership* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Integrated Benefits Institute. (2004). *The business case for managing health and productivity: Results from IBI's full-cost benchmarking program*. Retrieved from http://www.acoem.org/uploadedFiles/Career_Development/Tools_for_Occ_Health_Professional/Health_and_Productivity/IBIFull-CostResearch.pdf
- Jain, A. J., Giga, S. I., & Cooper, C. L. (2009) Employee wellbeing, control and organizational commitment. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*,30(3), 256-273. doi:10.1108/01437730910949535
- Jaskyte, K., & Kisieliene, A. (2006). Determinants of employee creativity: A survey of Lithuanian nonprofit organizations. *Voluntas*, 17(2), 128-136. doi:10.1007/ s11266-006-9008-2
- Jones, T., Pettus, W.,& Pyatok, M. (1997) *Good neighbors: Affordable family housing*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Kaliprasad, M. (2006). The human factor II: Creating a high performance culture in an organization. *Cost Engineering*, 48(6), 27. Retrieved from http://www.gfk.com/imperia/md/content/gfktrustmark/creating_a_high_performance_culture.pdf
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *An instructor's guide to the leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1997). *The leadership challenge* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2001). *The leadership challenge* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *The five practices of exemplary leadership: Non-profit*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Kreisman, B. J. (2002). *Identification of the drivers of employee dissatisfaction and turnover* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Austin, TX.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x
- Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). *Employee engagement: A literature review* (Kingston Business School working paper series No. 19). Retrieved from <http://eprints.kingston.ac.uk/4192/1/19wempen.pdf>
- Labor productivity. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/labor-productivity.html>
- Lawson, C. (n.d.). *How does a nonprofit organization measure success?* Retrieved from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/nonprofit-organization-measure-success-24149.html>
- Leatt, P., & Porter, J. (2003). Where are the healthcare leaders? The need for investment in leadership development. *Healthcare Papers*, 4, 14-31. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bwh&AN=27633049&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- LeClair, D., & Page, H. (2007). The high cost of not playing well with others. *New Hampshire Business Review*, 29(25), 33-35. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bwh&AN=27633049&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Leigh, D. (2001). *The relationship of several leadership styles, generative concern, values prioritization, and individual differences with goal-directed motivation and commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 250981546).

- Levinson, H. (1996). *Harry Levinson on the psychology of leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-301. doi:10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366
- Limsila, K., & Ogunlana, S. (2008). Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 15*(2), 164-184. doi:10.1108/09699980810852682
- Lipton, M. (2003, May). Envisioning growth. *Optimize: Strategy and Execution for Business Technology, (19)*, 2-7. Retrieved from <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CC4QFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Febiz.netopia.com%2Fmastery%2Fns-folder%2Fresources%2FEnvisioning%2520Growth.doc&ei=V6zxUsSLMMbCoASS6IHQAg&usq=AFQjCNHDZJZoWCXfzAa0vtwKcHOO3NAEag&bvm=bv.60799247,d.cGU>
- Little, B., & Little, P. (2006). Employment engagement: Conceptual issues. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 10*(1), 111-121. Retrieved from <http://alliedacademies.org/Publications/Papers/JOCCC%20Vol%2010%20No%201%202006%20p%20111-120.pdf>
- Lupfer, E. (2001, August). *Social knows: Employee engagement statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.thesocialworkplace.com/2011/08/08/social-knows-employee-engagement-statistics-august-2011-edition/>
- Lyne de Ver, H. (2009). *Conceptions of leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.dlprog.org/ftp/info/Public%20Folder/2%20Background%20Papers/Conceptions%20of%20Leadership.pdf.html>
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 498-512. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498
- Mathieson, K., & Miree, C. E. (2003). Illuminating the invisible: IT and self-discovery in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook for workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 93-107). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 11-37. doi:10.1348/096317904322915892

- Metropolitan City's Homeless Service Authority (2011). *Metropolitan City's homeless count report, including detailed geography reports.*
- Morrison, E. E., Burke, G. C., & Greene, L. (2007). Meaning in motivation: Does your organization need an inner life? *Journal of Health & Human Services Administration*, 30(1), 98-115. Retrieved from Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bah&AN=31174266&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Murphy, S. (2010). *Engagement: It's not optional anymore!* Retrieved from <http://questconnection.com/downloads/Engagement.pdf>
- Nairne, J. S. (1997). *Psychology: The adaptive mind*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2012a). *State of homelessness 2012: Appendix one: Homelessness in large metro areas*. Retrieved from http://b.3cdn.net/naeh/a18b62e5f015e9a9b8_pdm6iy33d.pdf
- National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2012b). *State of homelessness 2012: Chapter two: The economics of homelessness*. Retrieved from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/soh-2012-chapter-two-the-economics-of-homelessness>
- National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2012c). *State of homelessness 2012: Chapter three: The demographics of homelessness*. Retrieved from <http://www.endhomelessness.org/library/entry/soh-2012-chapter-three-the-demographics-of-homelessness>
- National Center for Charitable Statistics. (n.d.). *FAQs*. Retrieved from <http://nccs.urban.org/faq/>
- National Coalition of the Homeless. (2009). *Mental illness and homelessness (p.1)*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalhomeless.org/factsheets/Mental_Illness.pdf
- Nebecker, D. M., & Tatum, B. C. (2002). Understanding organizational processes and performance. In R. L. Lowman (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology* (pp. 668-691). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Northouse, P.G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Opportunity Knocks. (2011). *Engaging the nonprofit workforce: Mission, management and emotion*. Retrieved from <http://content.opportunityknocks.org/2011/06/14/opportunity-knocks-nonprofit-employee-engagement-survey/>

- Pace, K. (2010). *A phenomenological study: Human resource outsourcing's effect on leadership development and employee commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (AAT No. 3438396)
- Paloutzian, R. F., Emmons, R. A., & Keortge, S. G. (2003). Spiritual well-being, spiritual intelligence, and healthy workplace policy. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook for workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 123-136). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Polley, D., Vora, J., & SubbaNarasimha, P. N. (2005). Paying the devil his due: Limits and liabilities of workplace spirituality. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 13(1), 50-63. doi:10.1108/eb028997
- Quigley, J. M., Raphael, S., & Smolensky, E. (2001). Homeless in America, homeless in California. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83(1), 37-51. doi:10.1162/003465301750160027
- Rampersad, H. K. (2008). The way to a highly engaged and happy workforce based on the Personal Balance Scorecard. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 19(1/2), 11-27. doi:10.1080/14783360701602155
- Resolution Research. (2013). *Calculation sample size*. Retrieved from <http://www.resolutionresearch.com/results-calculate.html>
- Ridgeway, C.L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 637-655. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00233
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement: IES report 408*. London, UK: Institute for Employment Studies.
- Robison, J. (2008). Turning around employee turnover: Costly churn can be reduced if managers know what to look for – and they usually don't. *Gallup Management Journal Online*, 1-6. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=32056022&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Rogers, B. (2006). High performance is more than a dream: It's a culture. *T+D*, 60(1), 12.
- Rogers, P., & Meehan, P. (2007). Building a winning culture. *Business Strategy Series*, 8(4), 254-261. doi:10.1108/17515630710684420
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Test manual for the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* [Unpublished manuscript]. Retrieved from http://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test_manual_UWES_English.pdf
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716. doi:10.1177/0013164405282471

- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996), Maslach Burnout Inventory – general survey. In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds), *The Maslach Burnout Inventory test manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzales-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92. doi:10.1023/ A:1015630930326
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Schwinn, E., & Sommerfield, M. (2002, April 18). Revolving door dilemma. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, 39-42. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=6578242&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Seligman, M. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5
- Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning organizations*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.
- Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Shuck, B. (2011). Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10, 304-328. doi:10.1177/1534484311410840
- Skid row. (n.d.). In *The Free Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/skid+row>
- Soderfeldt, M., Soderfeldt, B., & Warg L. E. (1995). Burnout in social work. *Social Work*, 40(5), 638-646. Retrieved From <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9509275456&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Towers Perrin HR Services. (2003). *Working today: Understanding what drives employee engagement*. Retrieved from http://www.towersperrin.com/tp/getwebcachedoc?webc=hrs/usa/2003/200309/talent_2003.pdf
- Townsend, P. L., & Gebhardt, J. E. (2007). *The executive guide to understanding and implementing employee engagement programs*. Milwaukee, WI: ASQ Quality Press.

- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *American community survey 2010 1-year public use microdata samples* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t>
- Van Buren, J. (2004). *Everywhere except on top: Women executives in the nonprofit sector*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcase.case.edu:9000/fedora/get/ksl:weaedm202/weaedm202.pdf>
- Van Gelder, T. (2005). Teaching critical thinking: Some lessons from cognitive science. *College Teaching*, 53(1), 41-48. doi:10.3200/CTCH.53.1.41-48
- Volunteers of America. (2011). *Volunteers of America: Volunteer services*. Retrieved from http://www.voa.org/Volunteer_Services_Fact_Sheet
- Wagner, L. (2002). *Careers in fundraising*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wallace, L., & Trinkka, J. (2009). Leadership and employee engagement. *Public Management*, 91(5), 10-13. Retrieved from <https://lib.pepperdine.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bah&AN=40396056&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Wilson, K. (2009). *A survey of employee engagement* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 868722076)
- Wing, K., Roger, K., & Pollak, T. (2010). *The nonprofit sector in brief: Public charities, giving, and volunteering*. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/412209-nonprof-public-charities.pdf>
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(1), 21-33. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2162

APPENDIX A

Leadership Practice Inventory

To what extent do you typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and record it in the box to the right of that statement. Every statement must have a rating. The RATING SCALE runs from 1 to 10. Choose the number that best applies to each statement.

1 = Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 Almost Always

1. My manager set a personal example of what he/she expect of others.	
2. My manager talks about future trends that will influence how my work gets done.	
3. My manager seeks out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities.	
4. My manager develops cooperative relationships among the people I work with.	
5. My manager praises me for a job well done.	
6. My manager spends time and energy making certain that I adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	
7. My manager describes a compelling image of what my future could be like.	
8. My manager challenges me to try out new and innovative ways to do my work.	
9. My manager actively listens to diverse points of view.	
10. My manager a point to let me know about his/her confidence in my abilities.	
11. My manager follows through on the promises and commitments that he/she makes.	
12. My manager appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	
13. My manager search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	
14. My manager treats other with dignity and respect.	
15. My manager makes sure that I am creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of my projects.	
16. My manager asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect other people's performance.	
17. My manager shows me how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	
18. My manager ask "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.	
19. My manager supports the decisions that I make on my own.	

20. My manager publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	
21. My manager builds consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	
22. My manager paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.	
23. My manager makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	
24. My manager gives me a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	
25. My manager finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.	
26. My manager is clear about my philosophy of leadership.	
27. My manager speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	
28. My manager experiments and takes risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	
29. My manager ensures that I grow in my job by learning new skills and developing my selves.	
30. My manager gives the members of our team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	

© James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner(2003)
 Copyrighted Material–For Research Purposes Only

APPENDIX B

Request for Permission to use the Leadership Practice Inventory Survey Instrument

December 2, 2012

Permission Editor, Ed.D. Organizational Leadership

Dear (Permission Editor/Author):

I am a doctoral student from Pepperdine University's Graduate School of Education and Psychology. My dissertation is entitled: Leadership Behavior Practice Patterns' Relationship to Employee Work Engagement In A Nonprofit That Supports The Homeless

I am requesting your permission to reproduce, print and use the Self version of the Leadership Practice Inventory survey instrument in my research study under the following conditions.

- I will use this survey only for my research study and will not sell or use it with any compensated or curriculum development activities.
- I will include a copyright statement on all copies of the instrument
- I will send my research study that makes use of this survey data promptly to your attention.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by signing one copy of this letter and returning it to me either through fax 888-XXX-XXXX, or email: XXXXX@XXXXX.com.

Sincerely,

Valerie D. Williams

Ed.D. Organizational Leadership Student, Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

APPENDIX C

Permission to Use the LPI Instrument

JOSSEY-BASS™
An Imprint of **WILEY**

News

March 20, 2013

Valerie Williams
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX

Dear Ms. Williams:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to **reproduce** the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs. making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lshannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment. Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

- (1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
- (2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright 8 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission";
- (3) That one (1) **electronic** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent **promptly** to our attention; and,
- (4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to me either via email or by post to; 1548 Camino Monde San Jose, CA 95125. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,



Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
Epeter4@gmail.com

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) _____ Date: _____

Expected Date of Completion is: _____

 **WILEY**

989 Market Street, Fifth Floor • San Francisco, CA 94103-1741

APPENDIX D

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

Employee Work Engagement: Work and Well-Being Survey

Instruction

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the “0” (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	A few times a year or less	Rarely Once a month or less	Sometimes A few times a month	Often Once a week	Very often A few times a week	Always Everyday

1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy. (VI1)	
2. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose. (DE1)	
3. Time flies when I'm working. (AB1)	
4. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous. (VI2)	
5. I am enthusiastic about my job. (DE2)	
6. When I am working, I forget everything else around me. (AB2)	
7. My job inspires me. (DE3)	
8. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work. (VI3)	
9. I feel happy when I am working intensely. (AB3)	
10. I am proud of the work that I do. (DE4)	
11. I am immersed in my work. (AB4)	
12. I can continue working for very long periods at a time. (VI4)	
13. To me, my job is challenging. (DE5)	
14. I get carried away when I'm working. (AB5)	
15. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally. (VI5)	
16. It is difficult to detach myself from my job. (AB6)	
17. At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well. (VI6)	
Total Score	

Source: Schaufeli and Bakker (2003).

Note: VI = Vigor scale; DE = Dedication scale; AB = Absorption scale.
(Utrecht Work Engagement Scale–17 [UWES-17]).

© Schaufeli & Bakker (2003). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is free for use for non-commercial scientific research. Commercial and/or non-scientific use is prohibited, unless previous written permission is granted by the authors.

APPENDIX E

Employee Invitation Bulletin

Valerie D. Williams
 Ed.D. Organizational Leadership Student, Pepperdine University
 Graduate School of Education and Psychology
 XXXX@XXXX.com | XXX.XXX.XXXXdirect

Employee Invitation Bulletin

My name is Valerie Denise Williams. Mr. Vaughn has granted me permission to invite xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx Employees to participate in a study that I am conducting. I am a student at Pepperdine University pursuing a Doctorate of Education in Organizational Leadership. My study is entitled *Leadership Behavior Practice Patterns' Relationship To Employee Work Engagement in A Nonprofit That Supports The Homeless*. The purpose of the research study is to explore and understand employees' perceptions concerning the topic of employee engagement as it relates to leadership behavior practice patterns.

Your participation will involve answering 30 English language questions about best practices as a leader and leadership behavior practice patterns at the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx. You will also be asked to answer 17 English language questions about employee engagement in the workplace. Although minimal, there are potential risks that you should consider before deciding to participate in this study. For example, as a result of participating in this study, employees may become more aware of their feelings about his/her personal passion for the work they are required to do, which may affect their activity level.

Although there may be no direct benefit to you, a possible benefit of your participation is taking the opportunity to provide understanding that may contribute to shaping the future attitudes and behaviors of organizational leaders concerning employee work engagement.

As a participant in this study, you should understand the following:

1. Your identity and the identity of the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx will be kept confidential.
2. I will thoroughly explain the parameters of the research study and all of your questions and concerns will be addressed.
3. Data will be stored in a secure and locked area. The data will be held for a period of 5 years, and then destroyed.

As described above, no personal identifiers will be collected, therefore there will be no documentation of your participation in this research.

If you are interested in participating in this survey, please come to the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx Training Room (Insert Date) at (Insert Time).

Thank you in advance, and I hope you will agree to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Valerie Williams

2. I will thoroughly explain the parameters of the research study and all of your questions and concerns will be addressed.
3. Data will be stored in a secure and locked area. The data will be held for a period of 5 years, and then destroyed.

As described above we will not collect personal identifiers, therefore there will be no documentation of your participation in this research. If you would like documentation of your consent to participate in this research, you may provide your signature in the section “Option to Document Consent for Participation in the Research”.

Option to Document Consent for Participation in the Research

“Option to Document Consent for Participation in the Research: I am requesting documentation of my consent to participate in this research. I understand to my satisfaction the information of this consent form regarding my participation in the research project. All of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

Participant’s signature

Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

Principal Investigator’s signature

Date

APPENDIX G

IRB Approval Confirmation Notice

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

Graduate & Professional Schools Institutional Review Board

September 23, 2013

Valerie Williams

Protocol #: E0413D13

Project Title: Leadership Behavior Practice Patterns' Relationship to Employee Work Engagement In A Nonprofit That Supports The Homeless

Dear Ms. Williams:

Thank you for submitting your application, *Leadership Behavior Practice Patterns' Relationship to Employee Work Engagement In A Nonprofit That Supports The Homeless*, for exempt review to Pepperdine University's Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board (GPS IRB). The IRB appreciates the work you and your faculty advisor, Dr. Leo Mallette, have done on the proposal. The IRB has reviewed your submitted IRB application and all ancillary materials. Upon review, the IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations (45 CFR 46 - <http://www.nihtraining.com/ohsrsite/guidelines/45cfr46.html>) that govern the protections of human subjects. Specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) states:

(b) Unless otherwise required by Department or Agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from this policy:

Category (2) of 45 CFR 46.101, research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: a) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

In addition, your application to waive documentation of consent, as indicated in your **Application for Waiver or Alteration of Informed Consent Procedures** form has been **approved**.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit a **Request for Modification Form** to the GPS IRB. Because your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the GPS IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the GPS IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the GPS IRB and the appropriate form to be used to report this information can be found in the

Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual
(see link to "policy material" at <http://www.pepperdine.edu/irb/graduate/>).

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all further communication or correspondence related to this approval. Should you have additional questions, please contact Veronica Jimenez, GPS IRB Manager at gpsirb@pepperdine.edu. On behalf of the GPS IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Thema Bryant-Davis".

Thema Bryant-Davis, Ph.D.
Chair, Graduate and Professional Schools IRB

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives
Ms. Alexandra Roosa, Director Research and Sponsored Programs
Dr. Leo Mallette, Graduate School of Education and Psychology

APPENDIX H

Participation Letter and Informed Consent for XYZ Homeless Shelter

Valerie D. Williams

Ed.D. Organizational Leadership Student, Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education and Psychology

XXXX@XXXXX.com | XXX.XXX.XXXXdirect

Participation Letter and Informed Consent for the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

July 26, 2013

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Attn: Troy Vaughn

XXXXXXXXXX Street

XXXXXX, XXXXXXX

Regarding Study Entitled: LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR PRACTICE PATTERNS' RELATIONSHIP TO EMPLOYEE WORK ENGAGEMENT IN A NONPROFIT THAT SUPPORTS THE HOMELESS

Dear Mr. Vaughn,

It has been a pleasure delivering leadership and staff development training to the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx for over 7 years. As I mentioned during our conversation last September, I am a doctoral student in Organizational Leadership at Pepperdine University's Graduate School of Education and Psychology.

I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements for my degree in Education and Organizational Leadership, and I would like to invite the xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Referred to as XYZ Homeless Shelter in the Study) to participate. The study is designed to investigate to what extent, if any, leadership behavior practice patterns influence employee work engagement in a nonprofit that supports the homeless.

The following description outlines what the study participation entails, the terms for participating in the study, and a discussion of study participant's rights. Please review the following information carefully.

If your organization should decide to participate in the study, as the researcher, I will be responsible for petitioning individuals for participation and carrying out the study. I would like to post the attached bulletin in your organizations employees' lounge inviting non-executive or managerial employees to participate in the volunteer study at the designated and approved date and time. Participants will be asked to complete a 30-item survey addressing leadership best practices, followed by a 17-item survey addressing employee work engagement. Only employees that are able to read and write in the English language will be invited to participate. It should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the surveys. Research data for this study will be

collected in a manner that will safeguard the confidentiality of each respondent. The survey data will be stored in a private locked storage in researcher's office for 5 years, after which time it will be destroyed.

Although minimal, there are potential risks that you should consider before deciding to participate in this study. For example, as a result of participating in this study, employees may become more aware of their feelings about his/her personal passion for the work they are required to do, which may affect their activity level.

The direct benefits of this study include the fact that data obtained can be useful for the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and leaders within the organization in that it will provide insight into how to enhance continuity and work engagement among leaders and employees.

If participants should decide to participate in the confidential survey and find that they are not interested in completing the survey in its entirety, employees have the right to discontinue at any point with without being questioned about their decision. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~employees will not be required to answer any of the questions on the survey that they prefer not to answer—they may leave such items blank.

If the findings of the study are presented to professional audiences or published, no information that identifies your organization or employees will be released.

If you have any questions regarding the information that I have provided, please do not hesitate to contact me at the address and phone number provided below. If you have questions about your organization's rights as a research participant, contact the Graduate School of Education and Psychology at Pepperdine University. My Dissertation Chair, Dr. Leo Mallette, would be the direct contact person, and he can be reached at 760-799-0700. You may also contact Dr. Doug Leigh, Chairperson of the Pepperdine University Graduate and Professional Schools Institutional Review Board for the Graduate School of Education and Psychology office at (310) 568-5753 or gpsirb@pepperdine.edu.

By signing the acceptance page, you are acknowledging that you have read and understand what your organization's study participation entails, and are consenting to participate in the study.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information, and I hope the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ will decide to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Valerie D. Williams

PEPPERDINE STUDENT STUDY PARTICIPANT ACCEPTANCE

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXX Signature

Printed Name and Title

Date

APPENDIX I

Letter from XYZ Homeless Shelter Granting Approval to Participate

[REDACTED]

August 27, 2013

Valerie D. Williams
[REDACTED]

Regarding Study Entitled: Leadership Behavior Practice Patterns' Relationship To Employee Work Engagement In A Nonprofit That Supports The Homeless

Valerie D. Williams, doctoral student in Organizational Leadership at Pepperdine University's Graduate School of Education and Psychology has the permission of the [REDACTED] to conduct research at our facility for her study, "Leadership Behavior Practice Patterns' Relationship To Employee Work Engagement In A Nonprofit That Supports The Homeless".

Ms. Williams will post an Employee Invitation Bulletin in the employee lounge to invite employees to participate in the research. Ms. Williams will be responsible for petitioning individuals for participation and carrying out the study. I will not participate in the study. Ms. Williams's on-site research activities will be finished by September 30, 2013.

Ms. Williams has permission to use one of our on-site meeting rooms to facilitate the study at the designated and approved date and time. The survey will be facilitated and written in the English language. Therefore, only non-executive or managerial employees that are able to read and write in the English language will be invited to participate in the volunteer study.

It is the [REDACTED]'s understanding that:

- Research data for this study will be collected in a manner that will safeguard the anonymity and confidentiality of each respondent.
- [REDACTED] employees will not be required to answer any of the questions on the survey that they prefer not to answer—they may leave such items blank.
- No information that identifies [REDACTED]'s organization or employees will be released.
- Ms. Williams has agreed to provide a copy of any aggregate results.

If there are any questions, please contact my office.

Signed,


[REDACTED]
Vice President of Programs and Services