

The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) Formation in Leadership Effectiveness*

Josphat K. Kariuki
Pan Africa Christian University

A trivariate relationship between self-efficacy, leader–member exchange (LMX), and leadership effectiveness was established by eliciting the key traits of some supervisors and subordinate staff through open-ended interviews. A literature review verifies that self-efficacy is central to leadership. Associated concepts such as self-awareness, self-motivation, internal and external loci of control, and emotional intelligence are also investigated in this research. Their relationship with LMX behaviors and interactions between the leader and the followers are mapped. Individuals high in self-efficacy are seen to be high in LMX quality, resulting in effective leadership. This article contributes to the existing leadership knowledge with the finding that leaders and followers high in self-efficacy have high-quality LMX, and therefore, a more effective leadership process between them.

Key words: leadership, LMX, locus of control, motivation, self-efficacy

This study seeks to contribute to the impact of self-efficacy in the formation of high-quality or low-quality leader–member exchange (LMX), which, in turn, affects leadership effectiveness (Northouse, 2016). The self-efficacy and leader–member exchange theories are used as the underpinning theories for this research. Self-efficacy is one of the self-leadership concepts that helps leaders (and followers) to honestly self-monitor themselves and identify what they can and cannot do (Bandura, 1997). These concepts can be strategically used to empower leaders to effectively lead employees or followers within the diversity and globalization of current organizations. Northouse points out that “high-quality leader–member exchanges produced less employee turnover, more positive performance evaluations, higher frequency promotions . . . [and] greater participation” (141). Since self-efficacy aspects like personal characteristics and personality are part of in-group and out-group formations, it is thought that high self-efficacy can lead to high-quality LMX, and therefore effective leadership, due to mutual communication and trust between leaders and members.

*To cite this article: Kariuki, J. K. (2020). The effect of self-efficacy on leader–member exchange (LMX) formation in leadership effectiveness. *International Leadership Journal*, 12(3), 16–37.

Similar studies include Richter et al. (2012), on creative self-efficacy in contextual teams; Luthans and Peterson (2002), on the role of employee's and manager's self-efficacy in their relationship and employee engagement in an organization; Hodges (2018), on the effect of instructors' self-efficacy in teaching, especially in technology-based platforms; and Sears and Holmvall (2010), on the influence of emotional intelligence on LMX.

Theoretical Framework

Self-efficacy affects several critical areas of life, such as intellectual development, parenting, and health-promotive behavior, among others (Bandura, 1997). As organizations wrestle with strategies for maintaining a competitive edge and survival, effective leadership is required. Moss and Barbuto (2010) describe *leadership effectiveness* as “effectively managing employees through communication styles” (157). In a stricter sense, I would replace “managing employees” with “leading employees,” since *managing* and *leading* have different implications, though both are important. Self-efficacy is thought to be a core contributor to such leadership, considering that globalization and cultural diversity calls for a more inclusive leader with high emotional intelligence (Daft, 2011). Organizational leaders can tap into the wealth of different capabilities within their employees by focusing on their diverse belief systems (self-efficacy) through processes like self-awareness, self-regulation, self-monitoring, self-motivation, and emotional intelligence (EI), which makes their leadership more effective (Bryant & Kazan, 2013; Goleman, 2013). Neck and Houghton (2006) view self-efficacy as the main conduit that self-leadership uses to influence how individuals perform, which is why I chose to focus on it in this study. A hypothetical assumption is that self-efficacy will be reflected in the relationships it creates between leaders and followers, so that LMX becomes a mediating factor through which self-efficacy influences leadership. Path-goal theory, though not investigated in this study, reinforces the need to study how the self-efficacy of the leader and follower affects leader-follower exchanges and leadership. The theory considers leaders' behaviors as well as followers' characteristics, which relate to their respective self-

efficacies. House and Mitchell (1974) express *path–goal theory* as “how the leader influences the subordinates’ perceptions of their work goals, personal goals and paths to goal attainment” (81). The influence is based on the perception of followers about their abilities to achieve goals, which resonates with the implication of self-efficacy, the belief in their capability to achieve something. Further, the theory requires that leaders motivate followers to achieve their goals by making the path toward their achievement clearer (Northouse, 2016), yet the motivation works better when the leader–follower relationship is conducive. As expected by the theory, leaders will more easily remove obstacles and offer support to those close to them (*in-group*) than those at a far relational distance (*out-group*), hence the need to understand the LMX relations and interactions of the team.

Research Question

The following research question was formulated to frame this study.

How does self-efficacy influence leader–member exchanges and, consequently, organization’s leadership effectiveness, and how do these relate to other self-efficacy, LMX, and leadership effectiveness literature?

Those at both the supervisory/leadership level and subordinate/follower level were interviewed to reduce a hierarchy bias. This helps to gain perceptions of self-efficacy and LMX from both leaders and members. To elicit information from the participants, interview questions were formulated.

Literature Review

Self-Efficacy in Leadership

According to Bandura (1997), *self-efficacy* refers to the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (3). This serves to guide oneself on ways of enhancing human efficiency, so that both the leaders’ and followers’ capabilities are leveraged. Hoyle (2010) argues that self-efficacy includes our ability to use these capabilities or “competencies in specific domains and situations” (316). The process can be

broken down into two parts: identifying the capabilities and practicing the use of the capabilities. The action part of it is based on the extent to which people feel that they can achieve the appropriate outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (2015) posits that self-efficacy “is the foundation of human aspirations, motivation, and accomplishments” (5). If leaders can delve into identifying individual’s capabilities in their organizations and then create an environment in which each member thrives in the execution of their abilities, this would be a catalyst for effective leadership and higher performance. According to contingency theory, most situations will be different than those earlier experienced, and leaders and followers might need a different solution than one used previously. Leaders need to have the capability to “diagnose both leadership style and organizational situation” (Daft, 2011, 61). In all situations, Daft argues, the leader should endeavor to create favorable quality leader–member relations. Leader–member relations are gauged by the group atmosphere and the attitudes of the members to the leader and their acceptance of the leader. Trust, confidence, and respect of the leader by the followers result in good leader–member relations, while lack of these lead to poor leader–member relations. The self-efficacy beliefs can be constructed from mastery experiences, in which one masters the things necessary for success, probably by studying formally or by learning through “leader’s personal crucible experiences” (Thomas, 2008, 185). Bennis (2009) advises that true understanding is achieved by reflecting on one’s experiences, an aspect considered by Goleman (2013) to be part of EI. Vicarious experiences, in which one observes other people succeed and believes he or she can also succeed, calls for role modeling within the organization. Vicarious experiences require leaders be clear about their values and beliefs (self-efficacy) and clearly express them to others as good role models (Northouse, 2016). This is common with charismatic and transformative leaders. It is worth noting that followers have certain expectations of their leaders (Oginde, 2011) and are likely to emulate those expected behaviors. *Social persuasion* is where one is verbally convinced by others about his or her capabilities, as is the case with the use of charisma to ignite the “followers’ energy and commitment, producing results above and beyond the

call of duty” (Daft, 2011, 322). *Physiological and emotional states* are a person’s states of stress, anger, happiness, etc., at a particular time. The description of leadership preferred in this study is that of a process, looking at leaders and followers as equally important within that process (Chaleff, 2009). How leaders perceive their self-efficacy determines how much they initiate, intensify, and persist in leadership behaviors (Paglis & Green, 2002). In an earlier study, Phillips and Bedeian (1994) investigated relational attributes of leaders and followers as well as how they influenced leader–follower interactions. Specifically, their research confirmed that “follower extraversion will be positively related to leader–member exchange level” (1992) since extroverts proactively approach leaders in a quest for more challenging tasks and support than the introverts. Further research may need to be conducted on who and why is easier to influence between introverts and extroverts. Key self-efficacy components that influence the relationship between leaders and followers are explored below, including locus of control, self-awareness, and self-motivation.

Locus of Control

Rotter (1966) points out that individuals who attribute occurrence of events to external factors have external locus of control while those who believe in their ability to influence what happens to them have internal locus of control. Highly efficacious leaders and followers are likely to make an effort to make a positive change in a challenging situation than blame the situation. Individuals who possess internal locus of control believe in their capability to control what happens to them in their lives and perceive that their initiatives are the main cause of their success (Phillips & Bedeian, 1994). They are therefore motivated to initiate dialogues such as work assignments and schedules than simply complying with their leader’s initiatives. This is the mechanism through which internal locus of control leads to high-quality LMX. This indicates that the dyad relationship between leaders and followers will be high quality since the leaders can do more for the followers than formally contracted to do and followers can do more for the leaders and organization than they are contracted to do. Those who possess external locus of control do not see themselves as leaders (Padilla et al., 2007), and therefore have

low self-efficacy. The impact of this is that such individuals may not be willing to take responsibility in their workplace, tainting their relationships with their leaders.

Self-Awareness

Self-awareness relates to individuals' ability to understand themselves, their strengths and their weaknesses, or the "dark side personality dimensions" (Padilla et al., 2007, 177). That entails leaders' behaviors that hurt their relationships with coworkers (LMX), which affects team performance. Such dark side dimensions are tabulated by Hogan and Benson (2009) and include being mischievous, skeptical, and lazy. Self-awareness exposes the areas one can capitalize on to better one's leadership as well as areas to improve on. Perhaps the issues of moral leadership behavior can be more easily solved if the pressure to uphold ethics could come from the inside of a leader than from outside.

Self-awareness and EI are intertwined, and one is essential for the other. Goleman (2013) defines *self-awareness* as "having a deep understanding of one's emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives" ("Self-awareness," para. 1). Emotionally intelligent people are capable of understanding their emotions or feelings, how they affect them, and how they affect others. As a result of being self-aware, people are able to realistically evaluate themselves and ask for help where it is needed, rather than struggling with what they cannot achieve besides sustained efforts that lead to "apprehension, apathy, or despair" (Bandura, 1997, 1).

Drucker (2008) posits that "managing yourself requires taking responsibility for relationships" (38). The EI components suggested by Goleman (2013) revolve around managing oneself and managing relationships with others (empathy and social skills). Empathetic leaders consider the feelings of their followers, and mutually empathetic followers consider the feelings of the leaders, laying very fertile ground for high-quality LMX formations. Yukl (2010) extends the definition of *self-awareness* to include the moods and emotions of a person, how the two evolve, how they change with time, and how they affect him or her and that person's relationship with others. Emotionally mature people will possess personality traits such as self-monitoring (Oginde, 2011), which is likely to enhance their relationships with others. This is a useful ability in today's organizations with

huge cultural diversity, given that some actions may be offensive to one culture and acceptable in another. To establish good LMXs with members of different cultures, leaders need to be sensitive about other people's cultures vis-a-vis their own, balancing their ethnocentrism with that of others, also known as *ethnorelativism* (Daft, 2011).

Self-Motivation

Self-motivation "is the ability to stay focused, enthused, and motivated about one's own goals" (Bryant & Kazan, 2013, 22). Turbulent times separate efficacious people and inefficacious people: The former remain focused and maintain their enthusiasm and motivation, while the latter lose their focus, enthusiasm, and motivation. Goleman (2013) considers motivation to be one of the three self-management skills (the others being self-awareness and self-regulation). It has been observed that "efficacy beliefs play a key role in the self-regulation of motivation" (Bandura, 1997, 6). It is common to find efficacious people who use self-talk to motivate themselves even in difficult situations. They can use this self-motivation and EI to convert undesired states like anger into desirable outcomes.

Leader-Member Exchange in Leadership

Most of the current theories of leadership, such as authentic leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership, deal with the effect that leaders' behaviors have on followers' motivation, task attitudes, and outcomes. LMX theory deals with the dyadic relationship between leaders and members, and the effects it has on the followers, team, and organization in critical aspects of leadership such as trust and respect (Bauer & Erdogan, 2015). It does not consider leaders' and followers' traits in isolation, but the interactions between them (Northouse, 2016). LMX theory asserts that it is the leaders' responsibility to cultivate healthy relationships between them and their followers through the establishment of high-quality leader-follower interactions (Nevarez et al., 2013). Sheard et al. (2009) reiterate the "process" aspect of leadership and note that "it is not a linear, one-way event but rather a series of interactive events" (2). Intuitively, followership is also a process between followers and leaders. The

expectation that those in authority are the ones who possess leadership is negated by Davids et al. (2019) in their observation that “leadership is not authority” (6). Therefore, followers also determine effectiveness of the LMXs between them and their leaders. LMX theory is practically seen in operation when leaders have some members being closer to them than others. It may appear like a natural occurrence, but the theory suggests that the groupings can be used constructively to the benefit of the organization. Miner (2015) points out that leadership problems would be fewer when the relationship entails informal assistants instead of ordinary members (meaning they do extra work), in-groups instead of out-groups, and high-quality instead of low-quality relationships. Optimized use of LMX theory would target moving members from ordinary to assistants or co-leaders, out-group to in-group members, and low-quality to high-quality relationships. Northouse (2016) explains that members who are willing to do more than they are contracted to do in their job, engage more with leaders, and support leaders more form in-group membership. In return, they get more rewards in form of promotions and incentives. Members who only do what they are contracted to do for the agreed pay form out-group membership. The groupings could be one of the sources of organizational politics as identified by Daft (2010), since the in-group and out-group members may disagree on some goals.

Since high LMXs greatly influence goal attainment and thus leadership effectiveness, understanding the features of members who exhibit high LMX would help in shifting low-quality LMX members to high-quality LMX members. Some of the features of high-quality LMX members, as identified by Miner (2015), are discussed here. They initiate things, which can be seen as informal leadership. Chaleff (2009) refers to such members as courageous followers. Unlike others who may seek to maintain status quo, high LMX members take risks to bring change. They are keen on adding value to the assignments they work on, as opposed to carrying out tasks for the sake of completion. Working closely with leaders and building networks, they are proactive in seeking opportunities in which to grow, which aids their self-development. This also ensures that they do not become

obsolete and remain resourceful to leaders. A big plus for leaders is that they promote their leaders, which makes leadership easier and more effective.

Self-efficacy attributes, such as extroversion, influence LMX quality (Bauer & Erdogan, 2015). Bauer and Erdogan (2015) further argue that leaders' locus of control, self-efficacy, and optimism also positively affect the quality of exchanges between leaders and members. It can be investigated with a positive expectation whether employees' locus of control would affect the relationship in the same way. The similarity in leader–follower EI, liking, and attitudes are found to increase the quality of their exchanges (Miner, 2015). Leaders and followers with high self-efficacy have high self-confidence in their jobs and uphold strong LMX relationships.

Gestures of affection, regarded as one of the efficacy-activated processes by Bandura (1997), are said to contribute to the growth of the relationships between leaders and members, enhancing the collaboration and cooperation between them (Sears & Holmvall, 2010). The affective process, which is shaped by a positive self-concept (an aspect of self-efficacy), greatly affects the development of LMXs. This is so because efficacious people have *empathy*, explained by Goleman (2013) as the thoughtfulness in considering the feelings of others. Empathy tightens LMX and affects leadership in three critical ways. First, today's leadership is largely based on teams, the members of which will present different viewpoints, yet the team needs to disagree to agree. The leader should view conflicts in the team as constructive, not as a threat (Daft, 2010). Conflicts are expected on a team in which in-groups and out-groups exist. An empathetic leader will accommodate both groups affectionately. Second, globalization has introduced cross-cultural existence in organizations, and leaders should accommodate all cultures, even those different from their own. Dialogues within such platforms are easy to misunderstand, and leaders should hear the unsaid—reading and interpreting the emotions expressed by others. Finally, empathy helps connect leaders and employees that helps retain the employees and their unique talents. When facing an industry with stiff competition, it is paramount for an organization to avoid training and then losing their human resources to the competitors.

More research shows that high-quality LMX helps in the formation of employees' attitudes as well as affective commitment (Byun et al., 2017), which is thought to lay a conducive environment for leadership. We can therefore change the attitudes of employees to be more committed to the organization by first strengthening LMX relationships. A key determinant of LMX formation is mutual trust between leaders and members. While it takes great effort to build trust, it is unfortunately very easy to lose it. Minor unethical behavior, such as slight favoritism, can result in the loss of trust in a leader by those who feel sidelined. The competence of leaders affects their effectiveness, but Byun et al. found that a leader with low competence can circumvent it by strengthening LMXs to maximize members' competencies. Thomas (2008) supports this argument and posits that "leaders don't become leaders on talent alone" (230) but can identify and tap them from their employees who possess them. The same applies to competencies. One way of encouraging employees to use their competencies to leaders' advantage could be delegating some decision-making duties to them. They feel entrusted with the organization and thus get closer to the leader, resulting to higher quality LMX.

Leader–Member Expectations as a Basis of LMX Formation

Xu et al. (2012) relate LMX formation to supervisors' expectations of subordinates and subordinates' expectations of supervisors. Supervisors expect subordinates to be capable and competent in their tasks, which means they can work effectively to achieve the expected outcomes. Leaders test their followers' capabilities and competencies by giving them work assignments to see if they can complete them (Mahalinga Shiva & Suar, 2010). According to Miner (2015), leaders prefer members who are dependable and collaborative in their relationships—members who can be relied on. Graen et al. (2006) posit that employers are looking for employees who can handle team challenges by demonstrating team skills. The subordinates work hard to prove their worthiness by finishing the tasks. If they demonstrate capability and competence as expected, supervisors form high-quality LMX with subordinates. Leaders may award subordinates with more resources, autonomy, and recognition. Subordinates, on the other hand, expect the supervisors to be understanding or empathetic so that they can "feel" what they

experience in the workplace. They also expect supervisors to provide them with opportunities that will help them to learn and develop, so as to ensure career growth, as well as to be friendly rather than abusive. Xu et al. argue that abusive treatment of subordinates by supervisors would lead to poor LMX. This would cause supervisors to deny subordinates some resources, and, in return, the subordinates may decrease their efforts to serve those supervisors. This incapacitates leadership effectiveness. When expectations from both leaders and followers converge and tasks are completed, high-quality LMX is developed (Yang et al., 2016). What follows is high levels of mutual trust, respect, loyalty, as well as follower commitment, which enhances leadership effectiveness.

LMX Influence on Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a process in which charismatic and visionary leaders change and transform people by tapping into their motives, emotions, values, ethics, and standards. Such leaders shift the focus of followers from self-centeredness of needs to collective aspirations (Goethals et al., 2004). It requires high-quality LMX for leaders to effectively influence followers to change. One of the roles of transformational leaders is to ensure moral development of followers and raise followers' values to where they are operating with fairness and justice (Northouse, 2016).

Further necessity for the use of LMX in transformational leadership can be drawn from the transformational factors cited by Dugan (2017). First, the *idealized influence* involves a convergence of leaders' behaviors and followers' perception of those behaviors as worthy of respect and emulation. Leaders serve as role models, act in an altruistic manner, and demonstrate ethical behavior that followers can emulate. One's behavior is a reflection of one's personality, and who you are determines how you lead (Hogan & Benson, 2009). Second, *inspirational motivation*, which is the ability of the leader to ignite followers to achieve beyond the expectations of the leader and the organization, requires that both leaders and followers have a common shared vision. To genuinely (not through coercion) operate using a shared vision calls for a healthy leader–member relationship. Third, *intellectual stimulation* is a technique used by leaders to engage followers

in constructively questioning the leadership process to identify areas for improvement. Kouzes and Posner (2012) view the aspect of leaders challenging the process as one of the keys to exemplary or effective leadership. For leaders to involve followers in such a risky task, the relationship between them should be at the mature relationship phase of LMX formation. The fourth factor is *individualized consideration*. Transformational leadership is based on the individual needs of followers rather than the general needs of an organization. This is the principle of *leader-member exchange theory*, a two-way exchange communication between the leader and the member. In this relationship, “the leader demonstrates active listening, delegates responsibility, and creates learning opportunities that contribute to the growth and development of followers” (Dugan, 2017, 185). Oginde (2011) considers this active listening to be part of EI, which, by extension, is part of self-efficacy.

Method

To effectively respond to the research question, a qualitative approach was preferred over a quantitative approach for several reasons. First, the main interest here is the quality of the relationship between self-efficacy and LMX rather than the numerical measure and quantification of the variables. Second, much is known about self-efficacy and LMX, but in isolation from each other, thus the need to deepen the understanding of the mediation between the two variables in enhancing leadership practice.

This research used open-ended questions in an interview format for data collection to gain wider and clearer feedback from participants that other methods such as observation, documentary evidence, and questionnaires would be less effective in gathering. Corresponding follow-up questions further helped to clarify any ambiguous responses. The target participants were chosen from a spectrum of top management to subordinates for effective sampling. They are all employees of a five-star hotel in Nairobi, Kenya, with a couple of years' tenure, which suggests that the supervisors and subordinates know each other to a good degree.

To achieve saturation, two supervisors from different functional units/departments (marketing and food service) and three subordinates from the same two departments were sampled to broaden the contextual coverage. The supervisors were noted to work closely together and often exchange departments (especially those working in the various restaurants), thus an interview with a few was believed to be a reliable representation of the rest. A greater number of participants would have been interviewed but, unfortunately, some targeted participants were afraid of being accused by senior management of disclosing information that could be leaked to competitors.

In analyzing the responses, the related responses were grouped together in themes such as behavior, awareness, and motivation that are closely related to self-efficacy. This will inform the different strategies to promote the use of self-efficacy concepts in enhancing organizational leadership effectiveness. The outcome is a set of suggested self-efficacy-based strategies for improving leadership in organizations to cope with contemporary issues affecting leadership.

Results

Two supervisors from two different departments of the hotel were interviewed using predefined open questions. The questions and their responses are shown in Table 1 on the next page.

Table 1: Interview With Supervisors of Different Departments

Question	Supervisor 1 Response	Supervisor 2 Response
<i>Which of your work capabilities do you consider impactful in the success of your organization?</i>	Collaboration with other departments, learning from them, and proactive personal development	Perceives himself as a leader, sets own high targets, self-motivated
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	Teamwork, personal development, extroversion	Cognized-goals motivation, internal locus of control
<i>What do you consider as the major source of your job motivation?</i>	Personal targets, feedback	Passion for his job, support from superiors, recognition, being listened to
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	Cognized-goals motivation, internal locus of control	Intrinsic motivation, listening and recognition
<i>Besides your contract's assigned duties, what other duties do you volunteer to do?</i>	Volunteers to train her team and serve her clients beyond contractual terms	Meets staff for recognition, works extra hours, volunteers to support other departments
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	Out-roles besides in-roles (high-quality LMX)	Out-roles (high-quality LMX)
<i>At a personal level, how do you handle emerging challenges you face in your job?</i>	Listens to clients, dialogues with top management	Analyzes them, learns from them, empathizes with the affected member
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	Active listening, agreeableness	EI, high self-efficacy
<i>If you had a chance to hire new employees, what requirements would you consider from them?</i>	Minimum supervision and hardworking, experience and qualification come below these	Dependable, team player, adaptable
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	Dependability and conscientiousness, internal locus of control	Dependability, agreeableness, teamwork
<i>Which behaviors and actions of your employees or colleague supervisor(s) do you find motivating to you in your workplace?</i>	Teamwork, reliability, assertive subordinates, recognition of efforts by peers and superiors, being listened to	Teamwork, being involved in decision-making
Self-Efficacy/ LMX Aspect Derived	Teamwork, dependability, assertiveness, recognition, listening	Teamwork, participation

At their leadership levels, the two supervisors possess common qualities relating to self-efficacy and LMX, which positively affect their leadership effectiveness. Self-efficacy aspects common to both leaders include internal locus of control, which is described by Rotter (1966) as a key trait for highly efficacious people; cognized-goals motivation and intrinsic motivation, which Bandura (1997) views as major motivational forms for such people; dependability, which Miner (2015) considers to be one of the expectations by leaders for workers to complete tasks without supervision; listening and teamwork, which are components of EI (Oginde, 2011); and agreeableness.

On the other hand, the leaders are noted to have high-quality LMX, characterized by active listening, which is supported by Dugan (2017), who asserts that individualized consideration in LMX formation requires that a “leader demonstrates active listening” (185), and Goleman (2013), who considers it as an important social skill aspect of EI. The high-quality LMX is also characterized by performance of out-roles and volunteering beyond the call of duty, as well as teamwork. The high self-efficacy and corresponding high-quality LMX for both leaders suggests a positive correlation as a response to the research question: “How does self-efficacy influence leader–member exchanges?”

Three subordinates from the same departments of the hotel were also interviewed. The questions and their responses are shown in Table 2 on the next page.

Table 2: Interview With Subordinates of Same Department

Question	Subordinate 1 Response	Subordinate 2 Response	Subordinate 3 Response
<i>Which of your work capabilities do you consider impactful in the success of your organization?</i>	Self-confidence, ease of interacting with superiors and colleagues, asking for clarity when uncertain	Confidence	Confidence in handling clients (although intonation did not reflect this)
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	Self-confidence, extroversion, high-quality LMX, EI	Confidence	Low self-efficacy
<i>What do you consider as the major sources of your job motivation?</i>	Medical benefits, free transport, prestige of working in five-star hotel, remuneration	Medical benefits but not salary, which she perceived as small	Teamwork, career path development, and medical benefits
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation	No intrinsic motivation, only extrinsic	Extrinsic motivation
<i>Besides your contract's assigned duties, what other duties do you volunteer to do?</i>	Proactive, adaptable, takes out-role duties	Stands in for others only if reciprocated	Not excited to take up extra roles
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	Agreeableness, adaptability, internal locus of control (High-quality LMX)	Low-quality LMX	Low-quality LMX
<i>At a personal level, how do you handle emerging challenges you face in your job?</i>	Solves challenges directly and then notifies her superiors	Follows protocol, so does not solve problems directly	Often forwards challenges to superiors to solve
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	Internal locus of control, affection, high self-efficacy	External locus of control	External locus of control
<i>How would you judge the equality of employees' treatment by the management?</i>	No bias; if any arises, it is well explained such as preference to nursing mothers	She perceives bias or favoritism expressed in the form of greetings	Some leaders show favoritism based on friendship
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	In-group and out-group formation with management	Low-quality LMX	Low-quality LMX
<i>Which behaviors and actions of supervisor(s) or colleague employees do you find motivating to you in your workplace?</i>	Teamwork, caring spirit, being listened to	Teamwork, honesty, and reliability of colleagues	Teamwork, being listened to
Self-Efficacy/LMX Aspect Derived	Teamwork, caring, listening	Teamwork, dependability	Teamwork, listening

It is noted that Subordinate 1 has both high self-efficacy and high-quality LMX, as opposed to Subordinates 2 and 3, who are relatively low in both self-efficacy and LMX. In her responses and in line with her verbal and nonverbal expressions, Subordinate 1 portrays self-efficacy characteristics such as self-confidence, self-awareness, intrinsic motivation, and EI. As noted in the literature review, Goleman (2013) made a similar observation that self-aware people have self-confidence and know when to ask for help. He associates self-awareness with EI. Paglis and Green (2002) also argue that self-confidence relates to internal locus of control, as noted for Subordinate 1. Extroversion would be regarded as more of an LMX determinant than a self-efficacy determinant, following the research by Phillips and Bedeian (1994), which identifies extroversion as an interpersonal (hence relational) factor. Other behaviors and actions relating to Subordinate 1's high-quality LMX include working beyond contractual terms, taking initiative, being adaptable, and having teamwork skills. In-group and out-group formations here are well managed, so they do not affect her. Northouse (2016) recommends that a leader should target strengthening their LMX quality with all members.

The low-quality LMX for Subordinates 2 and 3 could be attributed to their low-self efficacy. Their motivation was largely extrinsic, rather than intrinsic, and they exhibit an external locus of control. Low-quality LMX is seen in their reluctance to take extra roles unless reciprocated and their perception of favoritism in leadership. Their self-view as being confident and team players could not be confirmed by their expressions.

Conclusion

This study sought to establish how self-efficacy influences leader–member exchanges and, consequently, organizational leadership effectiveness and how these relate to other self-efficacy, LMX, and leadership effectiveness literature. Supervisors 1 and 2 and Subordinate 1, who exhibited high self-efficacy characterized by internal locus of control, self-awareness, self-confidence, self-development, interpersonal skills (implication of teamwork), cognized-goals motivation, appreciation of feedback, assertiveness, job passion, empathy, EI,

initiative, affection, and caring, are the same ones who exhibited high-quality LMX characterized by extroversion, listening, involvement, reliability and dependability, recognition, and working beyond the call of duty. Self-efficacy is found to positively correlate with LMX quality. Similarly, Subordinates 2 and 3 demonstrated low self-efficacy through low self-confidence, external locus of control, and external than internal motivation. Their behaviors and perceptions revealed low-quality LMX in the form of clear perception of in-group and out-groups. They felt recognition was not as much as it should be and were hesitant to respond to the question of working beyond the call of duty. Subordinate 1, though at a follower's level, demonstrated significant traits and abilities similar to the two supervisors interviewed, which connotes that the high self-efficacy and the subsequent high-quality LMX led to more effective leadership, going by the definition of leadership as a process of influence between the leader and the follower. The findings are in line with the literature review's trends: high self-efficacy positively correlates with high LMX, and similarly, low self-efficacy positively correlates with low LMX as consistently verified in the study. Given the positive impact of high LMX on leadership effectiveness as elicited from the literature review, and the finding from this study that high self-efficacy leads to high LMX, we can intuitively deduce that strengthening the self-efficacy of employees would create more effective leadership.

Limitations and Further Research

The limitations of this study are that the gender representation was biased with more women than men, and the sample was relatively small. The hotel's staff is culturally diverse, and further research can be done to ascertain the impact of culture on its leadership. Further research considering a wider range of environmental and situational contexts would also reinforce the use of self-efficacy strategies in leadership.

References

- Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1997). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press.

- Bandura, A. (2015). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves*. Worth.
- Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of leader–member exchange*. Oxford University Press.
- Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. Basic Books.
- Bryant, A., & Kazan, A. (2013). *Self-leadership: How to become a more successful, efficient, and effective leader from the inside out*. McGraw-Hill.
- Byun, G., Dai, Y., Lee, S., & Kang, S. (2017). Leader trust, competence, LMX, and member performance: A moderated mediation framework. *Psychological Reports*, 120(6), 1137–1159.
- Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler.
- Daft, R. L. (2010). *Organization theory and design* (10th ed.). South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Daft, R. L. (2011). *Leadership* (5th ed.). South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Davids, B., Carney, B. M., & Getz, I. (2019). *Leadership without ego: How to stop managing and start leading*. Springer International, Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00323-4>
- Drucker, P. F. (2008). *Managing oneself* (1st ed.). Harvard Business School.
- Dugan, J. P. (2017). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives*. Jossey-Bass.
- Goethals, G. R., Sorenson, G. J., & Burns, J. M. (2004). *Encyclopedia of leadership*. Sage.
- Goleman, D. (2013). *What makes a leader: Why emotional intelligence matters*. More Than Sound.
- Graen, G. B., Hui, C., & Taylor, E. A. (2006). Experience-based learning about LMX leadership and fairness in project teams: A dyadic approach. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5(4), 448–460.

- Hodges, C. B. (Ed.). (2018). *Self-efficacy in instructional technology contexts*. Springer International.
- Hogan, R., & Benson, M. J. (2009). Personality, leadership, and globalization: Linking personality to global organizational effectiveness. In W. H. Mobley, Y. Wang, & M. Li (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 5, pp. 11–34). Emerald Group.
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path–goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 4(3), 81–98.
- Hoyle, R. H. (Ed.). (2010). *Handbook of personality and self-regulation*. Blackwell.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge workbook* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, 21(5), 376–387.
- Mahalinga Shiva, M. S. A., & Suar, D. (2010). Leadership, LMX, commitment and NGO effectiveness: Transformational leadership, leader–member exchange, organizational commitment, organizational effectiveness and programme outcomes in non-governmental organizations. *International Journal of Rural Management*, 6(1), 117–150.
- Miner, J. B. (2015). *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. Routledge.
- Moss, J. A., & Barbuto, J. E., Jr. (2010). Testing the relationship between interpersonal political skills, altruism, leadership success and effectiveness: A multi-level model. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 11(2), 155–174.
- Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends, and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 270–295.
- Nevarez, C., Wood, J. L., & Penrose, R. (2013). *Leadership theory and the community college: Applying theory to practice*. Stylus.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Sage.

- Oginde, D. (2011). Follower expectations of a leader: Most admired leader behaviors. *International Leadership Journal*, 3(2), 87–108.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 176–194.
- Paglis, L. L., & Green, S. G. (2002). Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(2), 215–235.
- Phillips, A. S., & Bedeian, A. G. (1994). Leader–follower exchange: The role of personal and interpersonal attributes. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 990–1001.
- Richter, A. W., Hirst, G., Van-Knippenberg, D., & Baer, M. (2012). Creative self-efficacy and individual creativity in team contexts: Cross-level interactions with team informational resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1282–1290.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectations for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1–28.
- Sears, G. J., & Holmvall, C. M. (2010). The joint influence of supervisor and subordinate emotional intelligence on leader–member exchange. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(4), 593–605.
- Sheard, G., Kakabadse, A., & Kakabadse, N. (2009). *Leadership teams: Developing and sustaining high performance*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thomas, R. J. (2008). *Crucibles of leadership: How to learn from experience to become a great leader*. Harvard Business School.
- Xu, E., Huang, X., Lam, C. K., & Miao, Q. (2012). Abusive supervision and work behaviors: The mediating role of LMX. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(4), 531–543.
- Yang, C., Ding, C. G., & Lo, K. W. (2016). Ethical leadership and multidimensional organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating effects of self-efficacy, respect, and leader–member exchange. *Group and Organization Management*, 41(3), 343–374.