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Abstract

With international public trust levels in 2014 at a record low, the importance of authentic leadership and its potential impact on society has never more important. Several studies have demonstrated the importance of authentic leadership in terms of its positive effects on organisational citizenship behaviours and employee performance which in turn serve to benefit an organisation. But what relationship, if any, is there between authentic leadership and the mental wellbeing and psychological capabilities of individual followers? This quantitative study examined the relationship between perceived authentic leadership in managers/direct supervisors and employee burnout levels and self-efficacy level (n=93). The research found a significant positive correlation between perceived authentic leadership and self-efficacy and a significant negative correlation between perceived authentic leadership in the Irish workplace. These findings suggest support for the relationship between leader authenticity and employee welfare.
Introduction

As the Irish and global economies struggle towards full recovery- business, economic and political disciplines turn ever more to the field of psychology for answers to their most challenging questions. This is evident from the small scale of psychometrically-measured recruiting by organisations to the large scale ideological battle of economic theories with game theory on one hand and the emerging field of behavioural economics on the other. Indeed behavioural economics has been proposed as a plausible blueprint for a new Public Policy Psychology as economist Ross Gittins (2012) suggests that it is psychology and not the field of economics which provides a convincing scientific model for understanding how and why people and by extension markets make the decisions they do. It would seem there is a shift away from viewing psychology as primarily clinical in nature and towards widespread recognition of it important role in shaping and understanding global events. In essence, the corporate and political world have been compelled by circumstance to acknowledge the important and complex role cognitive, emotional and even unconscious factors play in economic and political outcomes.

This is approach is especially evident in the field of leadership as a growing interest can be observed in the psychological attributes which give rise to positive forms of leadership, as well as its influence on the behaviour of followers and ultimately its influence on the performance of an organisation. This study has taken the concept of Authentic Leadership, as it has been developed in the field of Business Management by Avolio et al, and measured its relationship to the psychological factors of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997)
and burnout (Kristensen et. al. 2005) in workers. This study has been based largely on research from the fields of management and business and one of its aims is to draw on that body of research to add to the psychologically-focused literature on the subject of leadership.

**Authentic Leadership**

The importance of authenticity and the principals of authentic leadership have been gaining traction in the disciplines of both Business Management and Organisational Psychology (Avolio & Gardner, 2005) with promising research emerging from both fields for example Tonkin’s recent research comparing the effects of authentic leadership and transformational leadership on the citizenship behaviour of followers (Tonkin., 2013) in business and the study on authentic leadership and organisational culture as drivers of employee satisfaction (Azanza et al 2013) from the discipline of work and organisational psychology. But what is authentic leadership? Put simply, Authentic Leadership (AL) theory centres on the qualities of transparency, morals and ethics, balanced-processing (or fairness) and self-awareness of a leader and the authors of the authentic leadership questionnaire (ALQ) posit that authentic leadership is at the root of all positive forms of leadership (Avolio B.Gardner, 2005).

**Trust**

The 2008 global economic crash and subsequent political and economic events have done much to corrode trust in governmental and business leadership in Ireland. For example, The Edelman Global Trust Barometer 2014 survey showed that trust has decreased internationally since 2013 and also ranked Ireland among the bottom three of 27 countries for overall trust. The study emphasised the important role leadership plays in generating trust highlighting the “extremely low” credibility rating of Irish government officials at just 36%, with Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) evoking just a 43% trust rate among the general population, it also points to the direct link between trust in individual leaders and their organisations stating:

"trust in the person leading the company is inextricably linked with trust in the company itself. Actions taken by CEOs shape trust in the companies they lead and influence the behaviours and attitudes of their stakeholders’’
This summary report also identified integrity and engagement as the two key areas to be addressed in order to improve trust. Survey respondents selected positive attitudes and behaviours such as ethical conduct, transparency and openness, and fair treatment of employees as being factors of high importance when trusting a company or organisation (Edelman Trust Barometer Executive Summary, 2014.) each of these factors can be aligned with key elements within authentic leadership theory, namely morality and ethics, relational transparency and balanced processing. The findings of this and other reports (e.g. Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index 2013) serve to underline the importance of authenticity, transparency and integrity for organisations, especially in the Irish context.

**Composition, Origins and Comparisons**

Authentic Leadership Theory shares its roots with the humanistic psychology of Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow with the authentic leader sharing similar traits to self-actualised individuals (Avolio & Gardner., 2004). This is evident in the following definition of authentic leaders offered by Avolio and Gardner:

“those who are deeply aware of how they think and behave, and are seen by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspectives, knowledge and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and of high moral character”

(Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership Avolio & Gardner, 2005 p.321)

The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) includes a self-assessment measure for a leader’s own perception of their values and behaviours and a “raters” questionnaire which measures the perception of a leader’s values and behaviours from the point of view of their followers. This study explores the relationship between levels of perceived authentic
leadership (PAL) indirect supervisors and the psychological well-being of workers. AL is conceived of as a root theory of leadership, it is structured to be flexible enough to accommodate and underpin all forms of positive leadership and the most beneficial manifestations of positive leadership models. In other words, it is the contention of Avolio and Gardner (2004) that the core qualities of authenticity such as self-awareness and transparency are essential qualities for a good leader, whereas additional traits defined, for example in theories of transformational leadership, spiritual leadership and charismatic leadership may be positive but not essential to good leadership. While charisma or vision may be seen as positive attributes it is possible that a leader achieve excellence without them. Conversely, without an emphasis on authenticity, otherwise positive models of leadership may put undue value on “cosmetic” aspects of leadership (e.g. a leader’s media savvy, charm and charisma) and as such may underplay the qualities essential for ethical and effective leadership.

Avolio and Gardiner identified many components encompassed in authentic leadership ranging from positive psychological capital—which includes the positive psychological capacities of hope, resilience, optimism, confidence and self-efficacy, to leadership processes and behaviours—which include positive modelling, emotional contagion and positive social exchanges, along with models of follower authenticity which addresses the role of the authentic follower in authentic leadership formation. The paper compared authentic leadership with other positive leadership theories, identifying transformational leadership as the alternative model with which authentic leadership overlapped most. The transformational model, though it matched on and discussed many similar elements to authentic leadership, lacked detailed constructs of positive psychological capital, authentic behaviour in leaders, emotional contagion, as well as relational transparency and authentic behaviour in followers. However, significantly, the authentic leadership model differentiates itself not by containing more components than other leadership models but rather by excluding the wide variations in positive leadership style which are neither authentic nor inauthentic. For example authentic leadership does not include charisma, vision or an explicit focus on follower transformation by a leader, though each of these qualities may be positive attributes and may be present in an authentic leader they, according to Avolio and Gardner, are not required for and do not necessarily connote authenticity. The authentic leader is defined by their “own deep sense of
self” which ensures their clarity on important issues. Authentic leadership is described more as a root construct which can accommodate a wide variety of successful leadership but should form the basis for all managerial approaches.

In the 16 item Authentic Leadership questionnaire the four core concepts of AL are measured:

*Transparency*- measuring the degree to which a leader is straightforward and honest in their dealings with others. Transparency also encompasses consistency between thought, speech and behaviour across all levels of an organisation. A leader with high levels of transparency will be honest and say what they feel, engendering trust as a result. It is argued that transparency may be the best indicator of perceived leader authenticity (Valsania et. al. 2012) it may be argued that of the four component parts of authentic leadership, transparency is perhaps the most highly idealised and admired in organisational and social culture. However it could also be argued that Irish culture does not value transparency enough, recent revelations regarding the poor treatment of whistle-blowers among the ranks of an Garda Siochana (The Irish Times, 2014) and the enduring affection for the archetypical “cute hoor” politician or businessman, a tag which economist Chris Johns describes as being more a description of approval than approbation (Irish Times, 2014). Ireland culture also places a lot of value on discretion, politeness and in business- ‘professionalism’, though not negative in and of themselves such concepts do not encourage transparent actions such as full and honest disclosure, full emotional disclosure and “telling some the hard truth”. Of the four subscales transparency may also be the most difficult to judge from the “rater” perspective as it assumes knowledge of a leader’s true feelings and motivations and as such is perhaps most vulnerable to personal biases.

*Balanced processing*- measuring degree to which a leader fairly balances their own perspective, the perspectives of others and all other relevant data. It includes the capacity to analyse objectively in consultation with others (Tonkin, 2013). Balanced-processing combines two main psychological competencies- the willingness to forgo credit or total control in favour of an optimal outcome, and the cognitive capacity to discern which data is relevant and pertinent to a given situation. Balanced-processing implies that a leader is likely to engage in behaviours such as delegation and honest praise where appropriate and as such it is likely that this concept forms the basis of positive leadership behaviour outlined in
transformational leadership such as the granting of greater follower autonomy and active follower development.

**Self-awareness** - measuring the level of awareness a leader has of their own strengths and limitations and how those aspects of their personality and capabilities impact on those around them. Self-awareness may be similar to balanced-processing in that egoic rewards such as high self-regard may be compromised in favour of a more realistic view of ones skills and capabilities and how those skills and capabilities relate to others. Self-awareness may have to be balanced carefully with transparency as it implies the importance of considering how ones actions impact on the feelings of others, this fine tuning is alluded to in Bill George’s 2003 book on Authentic Leadership where is described how developing self-awareness meant tempering his honest reaction to a situation by considering the impact his tone of voice, criticisms and impatience may have on others. George describes how mindful present moment awareness and improved listening skills helped him to achieve a suitable balance between honesty and awareness of the needs of others (George, 2003).

**Ethics and Morality** – seen by Luthans and Avolio (2003) as an essential component factor of authentic leadership, it encompasses concepts such as moral courage, moral stamina and moral resilience especially when addressing issues of ethical concern. The Authentic leadership model does not endeavour to define what exactly ethical conduct should be but rather reiterates consistency with one’s own beliefs and personal ethics as such may prove deficient in the true evaluation or even description of leader morality. However the inherently subjective nature of morality means that absence of an explicit moral code in authentic leadership reveals an implicit moral framework which is not dependent on ethics by consensus, but instead unfailing adherence to personal values. Inherent in this concept is respect for the personal values of others and acceptance of their right to adhere to these themselves. An apt metaphor for ethics and morality as defined in authentic leadership theory may be the well-known Thoreau quote: “If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away.” (Thoreau H. D. Walden, 1854)
Several studies have shown a relationship between authentic leadership and positive follower behaviour and wellbeing. A 2010 study of graduate nurses found that when paired with supervisors who demonstrated high levels of authentic leadership, graduate nurses were more engaged and satisfied in their work (Giallionardo et al., 2010) with authentic leadership being most strongly related to dedication ($r=0.21$, $p<0.01$) and vigour ($r=0.19$, $p<0.05$). Wong and Cummings looked at the healthcare staff and the influence of authentic leadership on eight factors including burnout and job performance. Peus et al. took a detailed look at AL in their study *Authentic Leadership: An Empirical Test of its Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Mechanisms* (Peus et al., 2012) and found that authentic leadership positively impacted on followers’ satisfaction with their supervisor, ($\beta = .69$, $p<.001$), followers’ organisational commitment ($\beta = .52$, $p<.001$) and followers’ extra effort ($\beta = .51$, $p<.001$).

Beyond authentic leadership, other leader-follower research suggests significant relationships between the leader behaviour and follower wellbeing and performance. A 2010 systematic review of three decades of research including 49 research papers found that leadership styles were associated with employee stress and affective wellbeing (Skakon et al. 2010). Lopez et al. also found a positive relationship between production-orientation leadership style (as opposed to consideration-orientation leadership style) and employee emotional exhaustion (Lopez et al., 2011).

**Burnout**

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, the measure used in this study, defines burnout as a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion (Kristensen et al. 2005). It is predominantly associated with the caring professions but is evident to varying degrees across a wide range of professions from education and public administration to accountancy (Sweeney & Summers, 2002) and IT. A 2006 study from the field of behavioural medicine concluded that psychosocial work factors (such as low levels of autonomy, and lack of social support) play an important role in burnout regardless of profession (Lindblom et al. 2006). Burnout is also recognised as having high comorbidity rate with anxiety and depression (Straten et al., 2008) and as such may have long term implications for psychological wellbeing. A burnout measure was chosen over a stress measure in this study for several reasons - as the research survey was administered only once to participants it was important that information on longer term stress and disengagement was captured as opposed to short term stress which may be more susceptible to biasing by other factors. The Copenhagen
Burnout Inventory has three subscales, personal burnout, work burnout and client burnout and the two former subscales were used for this research. The breakdown of the burnout measure between personal and work afforded greater control for workplace stress and exhaustion, versus stress and exhaustion caused by external variables.

Employee burnout impacts negatively on the individual as it is associated with greater degrees of mental and physical ill health, loss of income and sometimes loss of employment. Burnout also represents significant costs to organisations as it is associated with reduced worker productivity, absenteeism, greater staff turnover and lower workplace morale (Paris & Hodge, 2010). As referenced in previous sections, there are many studies have explored and established the relationship between employee burnout and leadership style, this current study aimed to answer the question: is there a significant relationship between perceived authentic leadership style and employee burnout levels amongst workers in Ireland?

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be a significant relationship between perceived authentic leadership in supervisors and work-related burnout levels among employees

**Self-Efficacy**

In addition to negative factors such as burnout, the literature also suggests a link between positive psychological and work outcomes in employees and authentic leadership style (Gillianardo et al., 2010). Once such factor which has not been explored in-depth is the psychical construct of self-efficacy. The General Self-Efficacy Scale was used in the current study to measure this aspect of employee internal experience. Self-Efficacy can be defined as a person’s belief in their ability to successfully perform a task or exercise (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is an essential component in goal-setting and goal realisation and as such forms an important role in the psychosocial landscape of the workplace.

*Among the mechanisms of human agency, none is more central or pervasive than beliefs of personal efficacy. Whatever other factors serve as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce desired effects;*
Self-efficacy is associated with greater motivation, perseverance and affective resilience in workers and is often included as a mediating variable in studies on leadership, employee performance and burnout (Bandura & Locke, 2003). The dynamic interaction between leadership style and increases or decreases in self-efficacy levels among followers has not been explored to a large extent in the fields of either business or organisational psychology and as such there is limited evidence to support a relationship of this nature. However, a 2012 study on the relationship between leader motivating language and self-efficacy found that leader motivating language correlated positively with a 34% increase in self-efficacy among employees and a 20% increase in employee performance, suggesting that self-efficacy may be affected by leadership behaviour (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2012). As Avolio et.al claim that authentic leadership is at the root of all positive forms of leadership the current study aimed to address the question: Is there a relationship between perceived authentic leadership and self-efficacy in employees?

**Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant relationship between perceived authentic leadership in supervisors and self-efficacy among employees**

**Other considerations**
While there are a number of significant studies on the impact of leadership on employees from business it is important to note a lack of psychological research on some of the newer, emerging models of leadership and followership. Similar measures are often used in both the business and psychology and each field has a valuable contribution to make on the subject of leadership and its relationship to follower well-being. However, while the field of business can make credible claims regarding the ecological validity of industry lead research, it is the field of psychology which is best placed in the assessment of the psychological components of leadership and followership. Greater collaboration between these two fields would surely lead to a more comprehensive literature on a topic which plays such an important role in our day to day lives.

Overall there are some other common limitations to be found in the current literature. For example a large number of studies that looked at leadership and burnout are concentrated in the area healthcare which has its own peculiar organisational structures and conditions,
making it difficult to generalise results to other professional areas. For this study we have addressed this by drawing respondents from a range of professional fields. Other issues with the current literature lie with the channels through which participants are recruited and data is collected; in many of the leadership studies data is collected either directly through a company’s human resources department which may compromise the respondents sense of anonymity and immunity from negative consequences regarding their employer, and this affect could conceivably occur even when every step is taken to assure participants. The current study was administered predominantly through social networks and as a result the sample is not exclusively affiliated with any particular company or industry. Another notable difficult aspect of the literature on leadership is there appear to be few qualitative studies of leadership, specifically authentic leadership, which link leadership measures and the measures of other variables to the specific opinions and perspectives of participants. While the current study is not a qualitative study, qualitative feedback was accommodated in an effort to provide “real life” context for some of the scores. This qualitative data is not included in the results section but it does form part of the final discussion and helped shed some additional light on the more extreme scores providing some interesting potential leads for areas of future research.

In Ireland especially, there is a lack of leadership research from the psychology perspective. As well as exploring the validity of the two research hypotheses it is hoped that this study will provide a glimpse into the nature of leadership in the Irish workplace and its relationship to the follower working experience from a psychological point of view.
Method

Participants

This study used a sample of 93 Irish-based survey respondents (male n=33, female n=60) qualified from a total of 107 respondents, with 14 responses disqualified from analysis on the basis of not meeting inclusion criteria of age, location, employment status or completion. All of the qualified sample group were over 18 years of age, working in a job in Ireland for either 1-39 hours per week (n=51) or 40+ per week (n=42). All qualified respondents held a role level lower than CEO or Company Director and reported to a manager or supervisor. The participants’ ages ranged from 22 to 68 years of age, the mean age was 36.26 years old ($SD=8.5$). The length of time employed in the respondents’ current position ranged from .08 years to 20 years, the mean length was 5.31 years ($SD=4.82$). 94.6% of the sample had a third level education or higher (n=84). The gender of the respondents’ manager or direct supervisor was relatively evenly split with 48.4% male and 51.6% female.

The sample was obtained through chain-referral sampling via direct email, as well as social and professional networking sites including Google+, Facebook and Linkedin. The online survey was password protected due to copyright requirements of one of the measures (Authentic Leadership Questionnaire). Participants were invited to circulate the survey link to their contacts. There was no incentive for taking part, monetary or otherwise, however participants were informed they could obtain the overall study results by direct request once the data was processed.
Design

This study used a correlational design to assess the relationships between perceived authentic leadership in supervisors and burnout levels and self-efficacy levels in employees. The variables included-Authentic Leadership variables: transparency, morality and ethics, balanced processing and self-awareness; and respondent personal burnout, respondent work burnout and respondent self-efficacy. These variables were also correlated with a wide selection of demographic variables for use in descriptive and secondary analysis.

Materials

The electronic survey was given the title of Work Life Survey and was hosted on Survey Monkey. It was password protected by a single password circulated to all potential participants in order to comply with the copyright requirements associated with usage of the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ). The survey consisted of the following: an introduction explaining the nature, length and general purpose of the study; 12 demographic questions addressing various areas for example: age, education level, field of work, respondent gender and leader gender; The 10 item General Self-Efficacy Scale; two of the three Copenhagen Burnout Inventory subscales: personal burnout and work burnout were included (client burnout was excluded as it was judged to be less relevant to this study) containing six and seven items respectively; and the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire for “raters”, containing 16 items. The final survey item was an open-ended qualitative question inviting respondents to list words they would use to describe their direct supervisor. The debriefing page thanked respondents for their participation, invited them to send the survey link on to their friends and colleagues, and provided information on depression and anxiety support as well as general counselling resources might be required in the event of the survey raising emotionally difficult issues.

The Self-Efficacy Scale and the two Copenhagen Burnout Inventory subscales were reordered using the online randomiser at random.org. The authentic leadership questionnaire items were kept together in the final section of the survey so as to minimise the risk of framing the self-efficacy and burnout scales in terms of the employee-supervisor relationship.

The General Self Efficacy Scale
The general self-efficacy scale (Schwazer & Jerusalem, 1995) is designed to measure optimistic self-belief, which encompasses ideas around capability, persistence and resilience in the face of failure. The authors of the scale propose that high self-efficacy enables “goal-setting, effort investment, persistence in the face of barriers and recovery from setback” (Schwazer & Jerusalem, 1995). Respondents were asked to rate the truth of ten statements on a four point scale ranging from 1 = Not at all true to 4 = Exactly true. Statements included “I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.”; “It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals” and “I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities”. The total score ranged between 10 and 40, with 10 representing the lowest level of self-efficacy and 40 representing the highest level of self-efficacy. The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .728 for this study, making it a reliable scale. In terms of validity, The General Self-Efficacy Scale has been used in many psychology studies in its existence, which spans two decades, and has been shown reliably to have positive coefficients such as optimism, positive affect and work satisfaction and negative coefficients such as anxiety, stress, burnout, depression and ill-health, it has also been used to predict recovery time in heart patients (Schwazer & Jerusalem, 2005). The lowest possible score on this scale is 10, connoting very low levels of self-efficacy and the highest score is 40 indicating high levels of self-efficacy.

The scores in this dataset ranged from 23 to 40 and the mean score for this data set was 32.14, with a standard deviation of 3.592.

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) was used to measure burnout levels in respondents. The inventory consists of three subscales which are calculated separately, there is no overall burnout total. For this study the personal burnout and work burnout scales were used and client burnout was excluded as it would have applied only to a proportion of the respondents in the study and as such was not suitable. The two subscales of CBI used in this study have strong reliability with previous studies showing a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.87 for personal burnout and 0.87 for work burnout (Borritz & Kristensen, 2004). The CBI scales also have good predictive validity and have demonstrated by strong associations with sickness levels, sleep disturbances, use of pain relief and number of absences from work (Kristensen, et al. 2004). The personal burnout scale consists of 6 items which respondents were asked to rate on a five point scale ranging from “Always” which is scored as 100 to
“Never/almost never” which is scored as 0. Each of the rating scales are scored in decreasing increments of 25, so for example the second point on the rating scale is scored as 75, the third at 50 and so on to zero. The questions included “How often do you feel tired?” and “How often are you emotionally exhausted?”. The work burnout scale consists of 7 items which respondents were asked to respond to using a five point scale ranging from “To a very high degree” to “To a very low degree” or “Always” to “Never/almost never” as in the personal burnout scale. The first answer on the scale being scored at 100 with each score reducing in increments of each point along the scale until the last one (e.g. Never/almost never) scored at zero. One question on the work burnout scale required reversed scoring.

An average for the scales was calculated to give the final score for each. These scores ranged from 0 indicating very low levels of burnout to 100 indicating very high levels of burnout.

**Authentic Leadership Questionnaire**

The Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) (Walumbwa et al. 2008) measures the component factors of authentic leadership as identified by and developed by Avolio et. al (2005). There are two versions of the ALQ, one for leader self-assessment and one “rater” questionnaire which measures the perceived authenticity of a leader by their followers. These may be used in tandem or independently to assess a leader’s authenticity or, perceived authenticity. With the Cronbach’s alpha for the measure at .931 in this study the “rater” ALQ demonstrates strong reliability. The ALQ also has good validity as its subscales have been shown to be positively correlated with follower satisfaction and perceived team effectiveness (Peuss et. al, 2011) and have also been shown to be superior to transformational leadership measures in predicting follower altruism (Tonkin., 2013).

For this study the “rater” version of the ALQ was used. The rater questionnaire contains 16 items relating to four subscales: Transparency, Moral/Ethical, Balanced Processing and Self-Awareness. Respondents were asked to rate the truth of 16 statements on a five point scale scored from zero to four with “Not at all” scored zero and “Frequently, if not always” scored four. The following were among the 16 statements to be rated by the respondents: My Leader or Supervisor… “says exactly what he or she means”, “Makes decisions based on his or her core values”, “Solicits views that challenge his or her deeply held positions” and “Seeks
feedback to improve interactions with others”. The score for the four subscales was obtained by calculating an average score for each, there is no total ALQ score. The final scores for each range from 0, indicating very low levels perceived of an authentic leadership quality to 4 indicating very high levels of a perceived authentic leadership quality.

As this is most usually used as a commercial measure, the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire required a special application for permission of use through the survey and psychological measures website mindgarden.com. This was granted as the purpose of this study and proposed usage met the criteria for non-commercial research permission.

**Apparatus**

The study was conducted using an ASUS laptop computer running Windows 8 operating system, the online survey composition software Survey Monkey was used to compile the survey. The survey was distributed through a Gmail account to over 800 professional and personal contacts, via social networking site Facebook and via social networking site Linkedin. Microsoft Excel software was used to calculate and recode the dataset. SPSS was used to run tests of descriptive and inferential statistics. Microsoft Word was used for editing and formatting as of survey text as required.

**Procedure**

The survey/respondent experience was initially tested on a group of 8 participants. This process was carried out in order to identify key qualities and any problematic aspects of the survey/respondent experience including: length of completion time, technical issues with the survey, difficulties with comprehension, lack of clarity of instructions and any potential results calculation/data processing issues. Some minor changes were made on the basis of the feedback of this pilot study and the research continued as planned. None of the test responses were included in the final data set and the test participants were asked to forgo responding to the questionnaire again.

Potential participants were contacted by email which consisted of a brief explanation for the research including a non-specific description of the topic, the anonymous nature of the
survey, its approximate completion time and a request to forward on the email to any contact
the recipient felt might be suitable for the study. The email included a link to the online
survey as well as the password for same. A link to the survey, along with the password, was
also posted on a selection of special interest facebook groups (not necessarily work-related)
and the facebook pages of individuals. It was shared in a similar manner through LinkedIn
and google+.

Once participants clicked on the link they were brought to a page requesting a password, in
this case the password was “meta”. Upon acceptance of the password, participants were
brought to a page titled “Work Life Survey”. This page included a general description of the
survey including its focus on the Irish workplace and its impact on workers but did not
include the names of key variables (i.e. burnout, self-efficacy, authentic leadership) in order
to reduce undue priming and potential bias. For example, a respondent may like or dislike
their supervisor on a personal level, knowing that the survey addresses authenticity of
leadership may have primed the respondent to skew their self-efficacy and burnout responses
to in accordance with their feelings towards the supervisor. Similarly, the appearance of the
word “burnout” or “self-efficacy” may have primed them to consider how well these terms fit
their self-image or may elicit a response bias, wherein the respondent would answer the
questions in accordance with what they believed the research was trying to establish.

The first page also re-iterated approximate length of time it would take to complete the
survey, the right of the respondent withdraw from the process at any time, the name of the
researcher and supervisor, some of the basic criteria for participation, the planned treatment
for the data collected and researcher contact information. The participants then continued on
to the questionnaire, first filling in the demographic questions. Two of the demographic
questions acted as qualifiers, participants were required to be over 18 years of age, in order
for the study to be compliance with the PSI ethical requirements for child safety, and they
had to be currently employed to protect against misremembered workplace experiences. If
participants were disqualified on either basis the electronic survey immediately brought them
to debrief page.

Qualified participants continued on to answer all 12 demographic questions. When they
reached the section containing the self-efficacy and burnout items they were instructed to
“reflect on and answer the following questions as they relate to you”. They were advised that
there were no right or wrong answers and that they should select the response which most
closely fits their opinion. Participants then continued on to respond to the 33 items relating to self-efficacy, personal burnout and work burnout which were randomly ordered. All items required a response to continue on to the next question. Participants then continued on to instructions for the authentic leadership questionnaire which were as follows: “The following survey items refer to your leader’s (i.e. your manager or direct supervisor) style, as you perceive it. Please judge how frequently each statement fits his or her leadership style”. They completed the 16 items relating to authentic leadership. Finally, participants were invited to list other words they would use to describe their supervisor’s style of leadership. This was an open-ended question and participants could opt to skip it if they wished.

Once completed, the participant was brought to the final debrief page where they were thanked for their participation and given information on support services which may be of use. They were also asked to forward on the survey link to any interest parties and the survey link and password were repeated for their convenience.
Results

The IBM SPSS program V. 21 was used to carry out the statistical analysis for this study. The descriptive results (table 1.) medium levels of self-efficacy ($M=32.14$, $SD=3.59$), slightly lower than medium levels of personal burnout ($M=43.90$, $SD=18.22$) and work burnout ($M=43.71$, $SD=16.94$) and slightly higher than mid-point levels of perceived authentic leadership, the moral/ethical component of authentic leadership obtained the highest average score ($M=2.59$, $SD=1.20$).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables Related to Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal burnout</td>
<td>43.90</td>
<td>18.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work burnout</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>16.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Transparency</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Moral/Ethical</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Balanced Processing</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Self-Awareness</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inferential Statistics

Perceived Authentic Leadership and Burnout
Next correlations between the variables were calculated. Shapiro-Wilk test was used to establish whether or not the key variables met the normal distribution levels required for parametric testing, as only two (work burnout and personal burnout) of the seven key variables demonstrated normal distribution the non-parametric Spearman’s Rho test was used to establish the degree of correlation between variables (Table 2). A small but significant negative correlation was found between perceived leader transparency and personal burnout ($\rho=-.29$, $p<.01$) and perceived leader transparency and work burnout ($\rho=-.29$, $p<.01$). Indicating that as perceived leadership transparency increased work related burnout levels in employees decreased. Similarly, levels of perceived moral/ethical leadership and work burnout levels were significantly negatively correlated ($\rho=-.29$, $p<.01$) as were perceived moral/ethical leadership and personal burnout ($\rho=-.27$, $p<.01$). The correlations between perceived leader self-awareness and both personal and work burnout were smaller but still significant. Perceived leader balanced-processing was the only subscale of the ALQ which showed no significant correlation with either work or personal burnout.

**Perceived Authentic Leadership and Self-efficacy**

Self-efficacy overall was found to have a weaker but still significant positive relationship to three of the four authentic leadership subscales. Perceived leader transparency and self-efficacy ($\rho=.25$, $p<.05$) was the strongest relationship of these, followed by perceived moral/ethical leadership ($\rho=.22$, $p<.05$) and then perceived balanced processing ($\rho=.21$, $p<.05$). Perceived leader self-awareness did not have a significant relationship to self-efficacy.
Table 2. *Correlation table of key variables relevant to research hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Personal Burnout</th>
<th>Work Burnout</th>
<th>Perceived Transparency</th>
<th>Perceived Moral/ethical</th>
<th>Perceived Balanced-processing</th>
<th>Perceived Self-Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Burnout</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Burnout</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Transparency</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Moral/ethical</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Balanced Processing</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Self-Awareness</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*correlation significant at the 0.05 level
**correlation significant at the 0.01 level

A linear regression model was rejected on the basis of the sample size (n=93) not being sufficiently large to infer predictive power from a mainly non-parametric dataset. Scatterplots were generated for three of the more significant hypothesis-related findings and R squared...
values were included in these. Though these R squared values may bare some indication of what proportion of the variance can be accounted for by this model, the fact that the variables did not meet the normality of data required for parametric testing means interpretation of power must be limited given the relatively small sample size in this study. As such the R squared values were not considered when deciding on the acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis for either hypothesis 1 or hypothesis 2.

Fig.1 Scatterplot showing the relationship between levels of personal burnout and perceived Leader transparency
Fig. 2 Scatterplot showing the relationship between levels of work burnout and perceived moral/ethical leadership

Fig. 3 Scatterplot showing the relationship between general self-efficacy levels and perceived leader transparency.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived authentic leadership and follower burnout as well as perceived authentic leadership and follower self-efficacy.

Perceived Authentic Leadership and Burnout Levels in Employees- Significant Relationship

The findings suggest that the null hypothesis for hypothesis 1 can be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Higher levels of burnout in workers correlated with lower levels of perceived authentic leadership on all ALQ subscales with the exception of balanced-processing. This was true for both personal and work burnout. Indeed, work and personal burnout levels correlated highly yielding similar significance levels and correlational strength with other variables which suggested that these were not distinct but rather highly integrated variables. While Giallonardo et al.’s 2010 study on authentic leadership and its relationship to nurses work engagement and job satisfaction did not measure the same variables as the current study per se, it is still possible to draw some interesting comparisons in the results. For example, the strength of the negative correlation between perceived leader transparency and burnout (both work and personal) was -.29, significant at the 0.01 level, meaning there was a small but statistically significant inverse relationship. Compared to the positive correlation between leader transparency and job satisfaction which had a strength of .26 and was significant at the 0.01 level, the similarities are evident. Burnout implies a certain level of disengagement and job dissatisfaction so it is easy to see this may be an example of similar effect occurring in the opposite direction as we see in the current larger numbers respondents reporting low levels of burnout along with high levels of perceived transparency in their leaders. The authentic leadership in nursing study also showed that balanced-processing had the lowest rate of correlation with job satisfaction with a correlational strength of .17 significant at the 0.05 level which is comparable to -.12 and -.15 negative correlation between burnout and balanced processing which was shown not to be significant. The findings of the current study also showed similar authentic leadership and employee burnout correlations on most subscales with the 2009 Wong & Cummings Canadian study on The Influence of authentic leadership behaviours on trust and work outcomes of Healthcare Staff.
The correlations for all 4 AL subscales and burnout in that study ranged from -.21 to -.36, all correlations being significant at the 0.01 level, showing comparable results to the current study in which the correlation between burnout and the AL subscales ranged from -.12 to -.29. Interestingly, the Wong & Cummings study showed that it was balanced-processing which had the highest negative correlation with burnout which stands in contrast with the current study’s findings.

Burnout levels among respondents were slightly lower than the mid-point score of 50, though a large degree of variance could be seen among the sample, with scores ranging from 3 up to 89. Equally the full range of authenticity can been seen in each subscale from 0-4. The following are some examples of the words used by respondents to describe their direct supervisor’s management style. These are not necessarily representative but do add some insight to the terms in which leaders are evaluated generally.

**Higher burnout levels (≥50) and lower perceived authentic leadership (<2 on an average of all 4 scores):**

“autocratic and lacking in any emotional intelligence. Combative and not at all supportive”

“Very weak and lazy”

“Unethical”

“Flippant, disinterested, unsupportive”

**Medium-low levels of burnout out and (≤ 50) and lower perceived authentic leadership (<2 on an average of all 4 scores):**

“cookiecutter, hidden motivations, gaa, fianna fail, owned by his superiors and the board of the school( bishop and archdioceses)lives a life unexamined.”

“Authoritarian  Dogmatic  Autocratic”

“I like my principal. I think he has the schools best interest at heart. Most of the staff do not. He is not a good manager. I think he lacks people skills. - Maybe somewhat autistic. He does not know how to handle emotions.”

“Uncharismatic”
Overall it can be said that the correlational strength between perceived authentic leadership and worker burnout levels in the Irish workplace, though modest, is significant and in keeping with results of related research in the area.

**Self-Efficacy and Perceived Authentic Leadership - Significant Relationship**

In the case of hypothesis two- There will be a significant relationship between perceived authentic leadership in supervisors and self-efficacy among employees- the null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted. There was found to be a significant correlation between self-efficacy and three of the four authentic leadership subscales. Transparency again, showed the strongest relationship with self-efficacy with a positive correlation of 2.5 significant at the 0.05 level, the other subscales demonstrated comparable correlational strength with moral/ethical showing the next strongest relationship at 2.2, balanced processing at 2.1 all of which were found to be significant at the 0.05 level. The correlation between self-awareness and self-efficacy was not found to be significant. It can be said that this study has shown a small but significant correlation between higher levels of authentic leadership and higher levels of self-efficacy, as well as lower levels of authentic leadership and lower levels of self-efficacy.

There are few comparable studies of the direct relationship between authentic leadership and self-efficacy as self-efficacy is most usually considered to be variable which moderate negative or positive effects of leadership style. However, the findings are in line with other authentic leadership studies to a certain degree in that other studies looking at the relationship between AL and positive employee outcomes such as work engagement or job performance as in aforementioned Wong & Cummings 2009 study. Employee performance in that study correlated significantly with all but one of the subscales of authentic leadership (self-awareness showing only a low, non-significant correlation) with significant correlations ranging from .23 to .27 (Wong & Cummings, 2009). As self-efficacy has been shown to be positively and significantly correlated with task performance these findings offer an interesting point of comparison. Giallonardo et. al. found comparable levels of correlation between overall authentic leadership and work engagement (r=.21, p<0.01) which again shares qualities with self-efficacy and could be seen as an expression of high self-efficacy.
These connections are made with caution however as the Generalised Self-Efficacy measure was used in neither study.

The following are some examples of the words used by respondents to describe their direct supervisor’s management style, selected for high and low self efficacy scores. These are not necessarily representative but do add some insight to the terms in which leaders are evaluated generally. It should be noted that there was not a normal distribution of self-efficacy in this sample, the lowest possible score on the self-efficacy scale is 10 while the lowest in this study was 25 this is important as it means there were no respondents with very low self-efficacy in the sample.

**Lower Self-Efficacy and Lower Authentic Leadership**

“cold, harsh, unsympathetic, unprofessional, old-fashioned”

“Hands off style of management”

“Unethical.”

**Higher Self-Efficacy and Higher Levels of Authentic Leadership**

“Excellent delegator and good at creating clear and distinct lines of responsibility.”

“Authentic”

“Very relaxed, collaborative working environment”

While the correlational strength between self-efficacy and the subscales of authentic leadership is not large, it is significant and in line with other research of a similar nature. Thus the hypothesis can be said to be supported.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this research relates to the size and scope of the sample obtained. While there were benefits using snowball/chain-referral sampling (such as a more diverse sample
and greater sense of anonymity for recipients) it meant that inclusion criteria had to be more permissive than is optimal for a study of this nature. At just 93 participants, with seven key variables to measure and non-normal data, it was unfortunately not possible to report on inferential statistics it is likely that a significantly larger dataset would have yielded more robust findings. Some valuable insights were gained in by reviewing patterns and associations between leadership behaviour and follower outcomes through the eyes of followers, excluding leaders from the assessment allowed the collection of a larger unaffiliated sample, however, for a complete picture the study would have benefited from the leader perspective on their own leadership as well as their evaluation of their follower’s authenticity. As with all correlational research, causation cannot be inferred, and indeed it is possible that the attitude and abilities of the follower are the cause of either low or high authenticity scores as opposed to the other way around.

Given the subtly and nuance of human interaction, there can be little doubt that a good deal of the full psychological landscape of leader/follower relationships in the workplace is not captured through the questionnaire process and as such there is a strong case to be made for an integrated qualitative and quantitative approach in future research.

**Conclusion**

This study helps progress the theoretical connections between authentic leadership and follower burnout levels and self-efficacy levels. Though the correlations are generally small, in the 12 demographic questions asked in this questionnaire few showed any significant correlations with burnout or self-efficacy with “length of time in your current role” being an exception, this suggests that there exists a real relationship between authenticity of leadership and follower wellbeing. Of the AL subscales, it was transparency which proved the most significantly correlated with both burnout levels and self-efficacy levels, which lends some credence to the growing assertion that it is transparency which underpins the characteristics of authenticity. Though the correlations in each of the findings of this study are low, indicating a great deal of noise, the consistency of the findings suggest there basis on which to explore authentic leadership and its effects in the Irish workplace further. A more in depth, longitudinal study of both leader and follower authenticity would help reveal the true impact of authenticity on our working lives.
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Appendix 1.

Email which was sent to over 800 contacts. All addresses were Blind Carbon Copied (BCC).

Workplace survey for my final year research project

Hi everyone,

Hope you are all well. First off, sorry for the group email, I am aiming to get a pretty large sample group in short space of time so quantity is key.

As some of you may know, I am currently completing the final year of a psychology degree. As part of this degree I am running a research project around the correlation between aspects of well-being and work place relationships. The below is a link to a survey on same, it should take between 5 and 10mins to complete and is suitable for employees below CEO or director level. It is anonymous, and overall study results will be available on request once all the data is processed. If you could fill this in when you have a chance and/or send it on to anyone you think might be willing to do it I would be very grateful! Any questions at all you can get at this email address or

Length: 5-10 mins

The password is: meta

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/workplacesurveyireland

Thanks a mill!

Aoife B.
THANK YOU FOR CLICKING ON THIS LINK! BELOW IS SOME INFORMATION ABOUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

What is this questionnaire about?
This is a psychology study looking at life in the Irish workplace and its impact on workers. The overall final results will be available on request from the researcher (~no individual results will be made available.

How long will it take to fill in the questionnaire?
Approximately ten minutes

Do I have to complete all parts of the questionnaire?
You are free to exit the questionnaire at any point if you wish

Who is organising this study?
This research is organised by Aoife Barror, a final year student of Psychology at Dublin Business School. Aoife’s work will be supervised by Cathal O’Keeffe who is a lecturer at the Faculty of Psychology there.

Who can take part?
1. People over 18 years of age
2. People working in a workplace based in Ireland
3. People hold any position less senior than CEO (or equivalent for your workplace)

What happens to the Information?
This questionnaire will form the central part of my final year thesis. Participation in this study guarantees confidentiality. This means that while the data collected will be published in a research paper, you will not be asked to identify yourself on the questionnaire and there will be no email address or names associated with individual submissions.

Contact for Further Information
If you require any further information or have any queries about this study please contact the researcher:
Aoife Barror email:

Thank You!

Please continue on to the questionnaire....

ARE YOU OVER 18 YEARS OF AGE?
What is your age?

Select age here

Click on arrow to select

Are you male or female?

- Male
- Female

What county do you work in?

Please select a county...

Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?

- Employed, working 1-39 hours per week
- Employed, working 40 or more hours per week
- Not employed, looking for work
- Not employed, NOT looking for work
- Retired

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Other (please specify)

Which of the following best describes the principal industry of your organisation?

Other (please specify)
Which of these most closely matches your role level in your company or organisation?

Please select the one that fits best.
Other (please specify)

Which of these most closely matches your direct supervisor's role level in your company or organisation? (if you have more than one, please select the person who you deal with most on a day to day basis)

Please select the one that fits best.
Other (please specify)

Is your direct supervisor...

- Female
- Male

About how long have you been in your current position?

- months
- years

how many people work in your immediate work environment for your employer?

- 1-10 people
- 11-49 people
- 50-100 people
- 100+ people

Please reflect on and answer the following questions as they relate to you. Some are direct questions and some are phrases that you are asked to rate on a scale from "not true at all" to "exactly true". Please select the answer that most closely fits your opinion. There are no right or wrong
answers, please just select the option which you feel best describes your opinion.

I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it relates to your work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never/almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it relates to your work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it relates to your work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is your work emotionally exhausting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very high degree</th>
<th>To a high degree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>To a low degree</th>
<th>To a very low degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it relates to your work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Not at all true</td>
<td>Hardly true</td>
<td>Moderately true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your work frustrate you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel tired?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you feel worn out generally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Not at all true</td>
<td>Hardly true</td>
<td>Moderately true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel burnt out because of your work?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you think: &quot;I can’t take it anymore&quot;?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you emotionally exhausted?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coping abilities. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relates to your work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often are you physically exhausted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never/almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it relates to your work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never/almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I can usually handle whatever comes my way. (Please consider the truth of this statement as it relates to your work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Leadership

My Leader/ Direct Supervisor...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0- Not at all</th>
<th>1- Once in a While</th>
<th>2- Sometimes</th>
<th>3- Fairly Often</th>
<th>4- Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. says exactly what he or she means
2. admits mistakes when they are made
3. encourages everyone to speak their mind
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>tells you the hard truth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>displays emotions exactly in line with feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>demonstrates beliefs that are consistent with actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>makes decisions based on his or her core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>asks you to take positions that support your core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>makes difficult decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>solicits views that challenge his or her deeply held positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>analyses relevant data before coming to a decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>listens carefully to different points of view before coming to conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>seeks feedback to improve interactions with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>accurately describes how others view his or her capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>knows when it is time to reevaluate his or her position on important issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>shows he or she understands how specific actions impact others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other words would you use to describe your director supervisor's style of management and leadership?
Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire, it is much appreciated.

If you know anyone who might be willing to take this questionnaire I would be very grateful if you could send them on this link. www.surveymonkey.com/s/workplacesurveyireland
The password is "meta".

If you have been affected by any of the subjects in this survey there several services you can avail of which may be of use:

The Aware Helpline: 1890 303 302
Available Monday – Sunday, 10am to 10pm.

Aware provide face-to-face, phone and online support for individuals who are experiencing mild to moderate depression, as well as friends and families who are concerned for a loved one.
http://www.aware.ie

Samaritans, the 24 hour listening service- Call 1850 60 90 90

For information on where to find a counsellor or psychotherapist visit www.irish-counselling.ie

For information on workplace rights visit www.citizensinformation.ie