

Transformational Leadership and Organizational Change: How Do Leaders Approach Trauma-Informed Organizational Change...Twice?

Jennifer Middleton, Sarah Harvey, & Nina Esaki

There is increasing interest in the human services field in transformational leadership (Fisher, 2009; Gellis, 2001; Mary, 2005) and the association between this style of leadership and employee engagement, thus impacting the quality of services delivered (Everett & Sitterding, 2011; Mary, 2005). The Sanctuary Model®, a trauma-informed organizational intervention, promotes many elements of the transformational style of leadership, especially the elements of inspiration, optimism, encouragement, honesty, motivation, respect, team-orientation, effective communications, empowerment, reliability, trustworthiness, and empathy (Bloom, 2005, 2011; Smith, 2011). This exploratory, qualitative study examines how social service agency leaders have used a transformational leadership approach to implement the model in two different organizations.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

- Transformational leadership enables an infrastructure that influences organizational factors, processes, and expectations, for the sake of facilitating the sustainability of evidence-based practices.

Social work leadership has attracted growing attention in both social work practice and research. As social service organizations have had to adjust to changing social, cultural, economic, political, and demographic factors, knowledge of how leaders should act in these transformed organizations is crucial (Austin, 1997; Cooke, Reid, & Edwards, 1997; Rank & Hutchison, 2000; Stoesz, 1997; Tafvelin, Hyvönen, & Westerberg, 2014). Kotter and Heskett (1992) suggested that organizational cultures that are adaptive, where the culture encourages continuous change (compared to those that have a strong, notable style), or those that are strategically appropriate for current conditions are the best performing organizations (Frontiera, 2010). Despite increasing awareness of the importance of adaptive organizations, there has been limited research on how leaders approach the challenging task of changing organizational culture.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Rank and Hutchison's (2000) analysis within the social work profession identified five common elements in leadership: proaction, values and ethics, empowerment, vision, and communication. They also drew attention to the notion that challenges faced by social work leaders can be somewhat different from those experienced by other disciplines; challenges that may be generated by conflicts with professional values, a holistic and systemic orientation, the overarching con-

cern for others, and a strong desire to promote inclusive practices (McDonald & Chenoweth, 2009). Much of the core leadership approach uncovered by the Rank and Hutchison (2000) study is suggestive of a transformational style of leadership.

Over the last 30 years, transformational leadership has become one of the most prominent theories of organizational behavior (Wright, Moynihan, & Pandey, 2012). Bass's (1985) theory of transformational leadership was developed from Burns's (1978) thesis of transactional and transformational political leaders (Gellis, 2001).

According to Bass (1990), transactional leadership has three components: contingent rewards, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership (Packard, 2004). *Contingent rewards* are valued rewards received for performing desired behaviors, an application of the behavioral theory of motivation (Packard, 2004). When leaders engage in active *management-by-exception*, they monitor followers' (those they are attempting to influence) performance and correct followers' mistakes. When leaders engage in passive management-by-exception, they wait passively for followers' mistakes to be called to their attention before taking corrective action with negative feedback or reprimands. *Laissez-faire* leaders avoid leading (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

Transformational leadership is concerned with the development of the fullest potential of individuals and their motivation toward the greater good versus their own self-interests, within a value-based framework (Mary, 2005). Bass and Avolio's (1994) model of transformational leadership contains four components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. *Idealized influence* is when leaders choose to do what is ethical rather than what is expedient, and when they are guided by their moral commitment to their followers

and go beyond self-interest for the interests of the organization (Kelloway, Turner, Barling, & Loughlin, 2012). They serve as role models and exhibit behaviors that subordinates admire and appreciate in a way such that individual and organizational performance is enhanced (Packard, 2004). Leaders exhibiting *inspirational motivation* encourage their employees to achieve more than what was once thought possible through developing and articulating a shared vision and high expectations that are motivating, inspiring, and challenging (Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011). Leaders who manifest *intellectual stimulation* help employees to question their own commonly held assumptions, reframe problems, and approach matters in innovative ways (Kelloway et al., 2012). Transformational leaders intellectually stimulate their followers to challenge existing assumptions and solicit followers' suggestions and ideas (Wang et al., 2011). Finally, *individual consideration* occurs when leaders pay special attention to employees' needs for achievement and development; they provide needed empathy, compassion, support, and guidance that influence employees' well-being (Kelloway et al., 2012). Taken together, these transformational leadership behaviors are expected to motivate followers to achieve higher levels of performance (Bass, 1985).

In a study of 187 clinical social workers employed in a hospital setting, Gellis (2001) found that all transformational leadership factors and one quarter of the four transactional factors (i.e., contingent rewards) measured correlated with employees' willingness to put in "extra effort," satisfaction with the leader, and satisfaction with the leader's effectiveness. In another study that examined the applicability of transformational and transactional leadership styles to employees in children's aid societies and mental health centers, results indicated a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction, commitment, leader effectiveness, and satisfaction with the leader (Kays, 1993).

Despite the distinctions between transformational and transactional approaches to leadership, it should be noted that most leaders have the ability to use a full range of leadership behaviors that includes both (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). A recent study suggests that, in general, the most effective leaders use a combination of transformational and contingent reward behaviors, coupled with a low level of passive management-by-exception behavior (Gavan O'Shea, Foti, Hauenstein, & Bycio, 2009).

Transformational Leadership in Human Services

Given its emphasis on the importance of an organization's mission and outcomes, as well as embedded principles of participatory leadership, empowerment, and proaction, transformational leadership may be particu-

larly useful in human service organizations (Bargal & Schmid, 1989; Gellis, 2001; Mary, 2005; Wright et al., 2012), as such organizations have strong service- and community-oriented missions.

Transformational leadership has been identified in the nursing field as critical to addressing the increasing complexities in the health care field as well as emphasis on evidence-based practice (EBP). "The transformational leadership style allows for the recognition of areas in which change is needed and guides change by inspiring followers and creating a sense of commitment" (Smith, 2011, p. 44).

Similarly, this leadership style enables the creation of an infrastructure that influences organizational factors, processes, and expectations for the sake of enabling the sustainability of EBP. This focus on EBP is driven by patient expectations that the care they receive is based on the best available evidence (Everett & Sitterding, 2011).

Sanctuary Model

Based on the concept of therapeutic communities, the Sanctuary Model® represents a theory-based, trauma-informed, value-driven, evidence-supported (National Child Traumatic Stress Network, 2008; Rivard, Bloom, McCorkle, & Abramovitz, 2005), whole-culture approach that has a clear and structured methodology for creating or changing an organizational culture (Esaki et al., 2013). The objective of such a change is to more effectively provide a cohesive context within which healing from physical, psychological, and social traumatic experience can be addressed. As an organizational culture intervention, the Sanctuary Model is designed to facilitate the development of structures, processes, and behaviors on the part of staff, clients, and the community as a whole that can counteract the biological, affective, cognitive, social, and experiential wounds suffered by the victims of traumatic experience and extended exposure to adversity (Bloom, 2011).

The four core elements of the Sanctuary Model are (a) trauma theory; (b) the Seven Commitments—non-violence, emotional intelligence, democracy, open communication, social responsibility, social learning, and growth and change; (c) S.E.L.F.—an acronym for the organizing categories of safety, emotion management, loss, and future, which is used to formulate plans for client services or treatment as well as for interpersonal and organizational problem solving; and (d) the Sanctuary Tool Kit, a set of 10 practical applications of trauma theory, the Seven Commitments, and S.E.L.F., all of which are used by all members of the community at all levels of the hierarchy and reinforce the concepts of the model (Esaki et al., 2013). Typical implementation of the Sanctuary Model consists of an initial 5-day training on the model for key leaders in an organization. The leaders are

then tasked with returning to their agency and forming a Core Team, a representative group of employees from all levels and departments, who are the primary change agents to work with colleagues to implement the model. The Core Team is provided technical assistance from an experienced Sanctuary Model faculty person during a 3-year implementation period. After 3 years, the agency may choose to undergo a certification process in which they are evaluated on how well the model has been implemented. A detailed description of the Sanctuary Model, along with a logic model illustrating linkages between model activities and expected outcomes, is provided in Esaki et al. (2013).

Transformational Leadership and the Sanctuary Model

In their review of cultural leadership in organizations, Trice and Beyer (1991) argued that cultural formation and innovation requires a transformational leader. In order to successfully alter culture, leaders must address situations that had previously been ignored, increase collaboration, and inspire initiative (Kanter, 2004). Transformational leadership is concerned with the development of the fullest potential of individuals and their motivation toward the greater good versus their own self-interests, within a value-based framework (Mary, 2005). Authentic transformational leadership provides a more reasonable and realistic concept of self—a self that is connected to friends, family, professional colleagues, and community, whose welfare may be more important to the leader than the leader's own welfare. The leader's moral obligations to them are grounded in a broader conception of individuals within community and related social norms and cultural beliefs (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Given the Sanctuary Model's roots in therapeutic communities and the model's adherence to the Seven Commitments, there is much alignment between the Sanctuary Model and the elements of transformational leadership. Both approaches to organizational dynamics highlight the sense of community and adherence to ethical values that lead to the well-being of all, rather than a select few. A recent exploratory, qualitative study conducted after the successful implementation of the Sanctuary Model at the only maximum security female juvenile justice facility in a mid-Atlantic state suggests that the model may promote a transformational style of leadership (Esaki & Elwyn, 2013); though additional studies need to be conducted to further examine this possible association.

The Present Study

This study was conducted by three researchers to explore how leaders who initiated Sanctuary Model implementation in two agencies approached the implementa-

tion process. The research team began with one primary research question: How do leaders approach Sanctuary Model implementation? A qualitative methodology informed by grounded theory was employed to meet the study's aims. Qualitative methods are ideal when seeking to uncover what lies behind complex concepts such as leaders' approaches to organizational change. Grounded theory also promotes comparisons with other related work so that existing subject matter conceptualizations can be expanded or modified (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Recruitment and Sample

Sample selection consisted of purposeful sampling. Leaders of social service agencies who implemented the Sanctuary Model in two different agencies were identified by the director of research at the ANDRUS Sanctuary Institute ($n = 5$). Upon study approval by the institutional review board at the University of Maine, the director sent an electronic letter of invitation to each of the five leaders, which included an explanation of the study and invitation to participate in an interview. All five leaders agreed to participate and were sent an informed consent form in advance of the interview, informing them that the interview would be digitally recorded (upon their agreement), transcribed, and analyzed.

Three of the five participants (60%) were male, and two participants (40%) were based outside of the United States. While all five participants varied in the number of years of employment at their first agency (from 2.5 to 38 years), they were quite similar in the number of years of employment at their current agency, ranging from 21 to 31 months. The types of leadership positions the participants held at their current agency included director of social services, director of program operations, residential care and transitions services manager and global human resources manager, president and CEO, and executive manager.

Data Collection

Individual interviews were selected as the method of data collection. A semistructured interview guide, informed by the research question, was developed by the research team. The guide was designed to elicit leaders' perspectives regarding the Sanctuary Model as a tool for trauma-informed organizational change and consisted of 24 standardized questions. The guide included questions about leaders' initial introduction to the Sanctuary Model, motivations and experiences with implementing the model in the former and current agency, and the applicability of the Sanctuary Model to their work. The following are examples of the questions: How do the Seven Commitments apply to your job? How does the S.E.L.F. model apply to your job? Do you use any of the Sanctu-

ary Model tools? If so, which ones? How do you use the tool(s) and how often? How, if at all, has the Sanctuary Model changed your thinking/feeling/behavior toward your job and/or your clients? The guide was provided to all the participants in advance of the interviews.

Interviews of 60 minutes each were scheduled at the convenience of the participant and were conducted by two members of the research team. One researcher conducted all five interviews while a second researcher took verbatim notes and asked follow-up questions. Three interviews were conducted by phone, and the two international interviews were conducted using Internet video conferencing. All five interviews were audio recorded and transcribed, with each participant being assigned a numerical value from 101 to 105 to track their quotes.

Data Analysis

A four-stage method of analysis consistent with a grounded theory approach was used to analyze the data (Charmaz, 2006; Patton, 2002). The researchers approached the data analysis process by staying open and inquisitive to the primary research question. In the first phase, the two researchers who conducted the interviews discussed and noted the observations each had made during the interview and generated basic descriptions of the data. Transcripts were then manually coded independently by the two researchers through a process of microanalysis, and then the concepts were checked for interrater reliability. The three researchers then came together for a process of conceptual ordering of group codes into categories, and *in vivo* quotes were identified for each category. The researchers paid particular attention to how leaders described their experiences and engagement in the model, and the researchers found that these descriptions seemed to fit with a transformational style of leadership. The researchers then implemented a second wave of data analysis, using the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to see if the data did indeed fit the theory, and they found that there were data (i.e., *in vivo* quotes) to support the theoretical underpinnings of transformational leadership. The analysis process did not generate a new theory; however, it expanded the concept of transformational leadership as a factor appearing within or during trauma-informed organizational change.

Findings

The results suggest that the participants used a transformational leadership style, which is strongly aligned with the Sanctuary Model's Seven Commitments, to facilitate implementation of this trauma-informed organizational change intervention. When leaders spoke about their experiences implementing the model, they captured the essence of the core descriptors of trans-

formational leaders: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Although they didn't label them as such, they articulated their recognition of the importance of each of the core elements.

Idealized Influence

Leaders saw themselves as role models for the actions and behaviors promoted by a trauma-informed model. They understood that they needed to live the tenets of the model, not only to mirror it for staff as a way of teaching and reinforcing the concepts of the model, but also to ensure that staff would accept the organizational changes being made and that implementation would be successful. Quotes supporting this finding are below, with the assigned participant number noted in parentheses after each statement.

I'm kind of like the champion for Sanctuary here at the agency, so if I don't practice them [the Seven Commitments], people aren't going to buy into it as much. (101)

It really is a top-down model. If your board and your executive director don't walk the talk as much as possible, it really doesn't work because if the staff don't see behaviors on the upper level, then you're just giving this lip service. (103)

But more than that, the leaders understood that organizational culture change included every person in the organization, and that meant acknowledging and managing their own personal issues as a factor that was as important as managing the issues that arose in the staff and clients. In fact, the perspective they had on modeling behaviors stretched well beyond the workplace and into the rest of their lives.

I definitely have to use my S.E.L.F. to walk away at times when things just...seem to continue being in crisis. (101)

I think the S.E.L.F. model makes it safe to maybe admit that you're not okay yourself, and so sometimes things get overwhelming, or that you have had personal losses, and particularly in the leadership role. I think staff really expect you to be pretty much 100% perfect....You can't ever come to work having a bad day because staff get frightened if you're not okay, and so I think the S.E.L.F. model helps you work through your own things so that you can be the person that staff expect you to be without taking on everybody else's baggage, and then maybe not doing your best work. (102)

Having the Seven Commitments is really an awareness tool to remember, even on your worst day, to be in line with those things, so it's top of mind... really challenging yourself when you make decisions, when you go to roll something out—like is this in alignment with those values? It's just another layer of accountability; before you do things, it's to double check that you have upheld those principles. (102)

Again, we talk the Commitments, so we have to try to exhibit them and live by them. I mean, each one of the Commitments does apply to my job—actually they apply to life. (103)

Inspirational Motivation

The ability to inspire and motivate staff was reported to be especially helpful during times of organizational change and upheaval, such as during Sanctuary Model implementation. These leaders strove to increase a sense of shared belief with staff in the mission and vision of the future of their organizations. They understood that including staff from the very beginning and empowering them to ask questions and contribute to the conversation—even prior to implementation in some cases—was important to fostering employee engagement and facilitating model implementation. They challenged others to accomplish goals that to others may have seemed to be out of reach or too much effort.

So at that time we had an information session for our board and leadership team, so not just our senior management team, but all of those people that report directly to us all came to the information session, so there's been a lot more involvement, a lot more lead up, a lot more little chipping away of people's understanding of Sanctuary and how it might be used to benefit the agency before we've actually launched into any big sort of information sessions. So managers have all gone back to their teams and talked to them like, "this might be something we might be doing," given out links to websites, given out articles to read, talked about it in team meetings, so this has not come as a shock that one day you're being invited to a Sanctuary information session prelaunch of the model. (102)

Staff are pretty aware that the agency was likely to take this step and why we were taking the step was really about benefiting them. So that basic change principles about the message about "what's in it for me," "how am I going to benefit," "how is it going to impact me," all those things have really been taken care of in the way we've gone out to people to communicate that it was coming and how we think that we will benefit. We don't know this yet, but

how we think this will benefit us down the track is we won't get all the "we weren't asked," "we weren't told," "we didn't know anything about it," and "all of a sudden we're just told we're doing Sanctuary"...so we hope that's going to reduce resistance. (102)

When we first learned about the model...one of our senior operations managers...really took the ball and ran with it...She would push with the core group and with implementing in services. She took a lot of initiative with organizing the modules for training and stuff like that, and was very much a driving force, and I think that took a lot of the other effort than many of us would've had to put in. She actually put that in and had a huge vested interest in making it work. And I think she also had the kind of personality that really inspires caseworkers because she had worked her way up from being a caseworker. She really loved the kids she worked with so when she trained, when she communicated, she had so much passion, she really won the hearts of everyone the way she communicated the message. And I think that was really, really powerful...and we were really lucky to have her. (105)

Intellectual Stimulation

Leaders intellectually stimulated staff in a variety of positive ways, such as helping staff look at problems from a different perspective and questioning assumptions they carried about problems within the organization as well as assumptions about their roles as staff members. Including staff in discussions showed respect for staff voices and participation in organizational matters.

I'm fortunate here that we have an all staff meeting once a month and it's very well attended...At any given all staff meeting, there are probably 150 people there. We feed them. We pay them, of course, but we feed them pizza every time. But you know, I open it up in those meetings, and after two and a half years, they finally have begun to ask questions, and I ask questions back to them, and we have kind of an open dialogue. I think I can credit Sanctuary for that as well. (104)

We've really encouraged the open communication... and I think the atmosphere in doing that has been different from if we just jumped in and gone into crisis mode and said "we're taking control here." I think they really felt they've been part of the process, and I think if we hadn't been through the recent Sanctuary training, I think we would've fallen back into our old ways of doing things, jumping and solving the crisis, and staff would've felt quite left

out, so that's a really good example of an opportunity that's come up very suddenly, but we were able to use certainly parts of Sanctuary in that. (105)

The ability to reframe problems also allowed the organization to weather issues like workforce reductions and changes in organizational structure.

You know, when you have had to make bad, hard decisions that have impacted people, and helping them even if they're not familiar with Sanctuary, but helping them without using S.E.L.F. in a stated way, but helping them with things you might know that would help them work through those stages, particularly from loss to future, and so I think when you've had to make the change that's created a loss for someone, being much more aware of that and then helping them identify their alternative future, has been a way to help people embrace necessary change that wasn't seen as so positive for them personally. (102)

So during this...four years, budgets were being released, and one or two or three facilities were being closed and all of the stress, the chronic stress, that causes in the system as people are now thinking about their jobs, they really don't think about the kids, and they don't really see a future, and they begin to act differently. What Sanctuary did during all of that was to address that and to keep people focused on their work...they were so upset. "We've done this great job here for 35 years and they never commended us for all the good things we did, but they close the facility." Well, then he [the Sanctuary faculty] talked to them a little bit about...what are the good things about this place, and "What did you learn?" "Who did you meet?" And then he finished it up in an hour, and in the end he says, "Would you do it all again, knowing that on this day, this place was going to close, would you still do it?" and they all said, "Yeah, we would," and it ended very happy, and they were able to say, "Yeah, there were benefits from working here," "Yeah, it didn't end the way we would've liked it to, but you know, I worked here for 20 years, 15 years," and that was something that Sanctuary does to help people. (103)

Helping staff to reframe their own problems had the added effect of reciprocal influence, as it changed the way leaders managed problems and crises.

I think as you get into executive positions, you so much have the power if you like, and sometimes you just want to get rid of a problem, and sometimes in doing that we are being quite violent towards people,

and I think that's where we're taking a different perspective...pulling the team in and having the open communication and making it an opportunity for learning and growth and change rather than making it punitive...It's certainly great to have the tools to be able to do that. (105)

Individual Consideration

These leaders exhibited individual consideration to staff, being supportive of their needs and showing concern for their well-being, work-life balance, and physical and emotional safety.

It [Sanctuary] was the one model that also was focused on staff needs as well as client needs, so when we did an evaluation of all of the various different models that are out there, most of them are only client intervention, whereas I guess what we felt Sanctuary offered that others didn't was the scope of working with staff so that they would be in the best position to do their best work, because it really focuses on staff well-being. (102)

I'm using S.E.L.F. as a supervision form for the staff, so we talk about the physical safety, are they taking time off, are they having an adequate work-life balance?... How are they handling crises with emotions management with children? Are they getting pulled into the parallel processes?...Do they have any personal losses or have children left kind of abruptly?...Where do they see their role in the agency in the future and what are some of their future goals? (101)

Because most of the training goes back to helping them recall their own things...it's real easy then to relate it to other people, when you get people to start to think about, well, has anything like this ever happened to you? You know that ACEs [Adverse Childhood Experiences] study, for example. It's a great way for people to get talking about things that may have happened to the people who are in the room without us having to identify, yeah, that happened to me in my life. (103)

These leaders were also cognizant of staff need for authentic learning and development, and the importance of praising staff for a job well done.

We want to not just get through the modules but we want to understand the modules, so this will be our third week on the parallel process and red flag meetings because we just want to make sure that we understand it before we move forward. (101)

I started a thing at my agency, we do Monday morning heroes, and it's based on the Seven Commitments.... We identify heroes, and then send out a memo...saying the Monday morning heroes for this Monday are, for emotional intelligence, these people because they did this, for social responsibility, these people, because they did that. So we are using it that way. (103)

Finally, use of the Sanctuary Model tools enabled leaders to address staff concerns and confront difficult issues like organizational change and vicarious trauma. The leaders described improved staff engagement, involvement, and authenticity, and decreased staff turnover.

Interestingly enough, we've had a recent change in the executive manager for culture and workforce development, and he's been here probably about 6 weeks now. He came in just probably 2 weeks before Sanctuary training was on, and he came out of it and said, "I have the tool for all that I need to do; I can use Sanctuary." (105)

You know definitely more focus on feelings, and I saw a transition from when we first started introducing community meetings from where they were happy, happy, happy all the time, to where the staff were, where the staff meetings were starting to be more real with their feelings, you know, their facial expressions were starting to match actually what they were saying. So I saw that, and like I said, more staff involvement...I definitely saw a lot of changes in regard to staff. (101)

I think that, generally speaking, staff are fearful that they will lose that sense of involvement and the values and the history of the [founder's] influence will be lost, and so that I guess from a leadership point of view, we feel that Sanctuary, because the values of Sanctuary and the values of the [founders] are so very aligned, that we feel by adopting Sanctuary and adopting some of the rituals and adopting particularly things like the shared governance of the core team, even though we have to move towards a more corporatized approach to running the organization, we feel we can offset that by implementing structures like the core team so that staff don't feel that they've lost their voice in the organization. And that we're doing that at the same time as the changes are hitting so we don't have to go through a massive process before we start to respond to how we might support people better. We're trying to do that in a parallel process. (102)

So I think the Seven Commitments obviously improves behavior in the workplace, you know, having focus, having that shared language to challenge people on. Again, a cultural thing in [our country] I guess is that people aren't very good at challenging people about disagreements, so they often just smile and say things are fine when they're really not. And so I guess the shared language of Sanctuary had helped staff on that very small level at that stage just start to open up the opportunity to maybe have some more difficult conversations that once would probably have been buried. (102)

We also saw a decrease in turnover. We saw people staying longer because they liked the environment that they were working in. And of course, as you probably know, we weren't just dealing with an environment for—in our cottages and in our community services—but we were doing it agency-wide...organizational-wide culture change, so people really...we believe that people liked that environment and didn't want to move on, so we kept people longer too. (104)

Limitations

Several limitations exist in the present study. First, the exploratory, qualitative approach used in this study only provides an initial, cross-sectional, qualitative examination of complex constructs and does not allow for a comprehensive understanding of transformational leadership and organizational change that quantitative methods might address. Additionally, the study used a small convenience sample of human service agency leaders who met the strict sample selection criteria.

This study also only collected data from the leaders' perspective. We don't really know if these leaders are transformational, as we did not gather information from their followers. A more inclusive approach, including the perspectives of followers, supervisors, external stakeholders, and clients would help confirm whether or not these leaders are truly transformational.

Last, given the cross-sectional nature of this study, we cannot say whether or not the Sanctuary Model inspires leaders to become transformational. The study participants may have already been transformational leaders and, thus, were attracted to the model; they may have had transformational leadership leanings, only to be further supported by the model; or, perhaps, the model did support these individuals in changing their leadership style from another form to one that is truly transformational. Further research would be required to examine these dynamics.

Discussion and Implications for Practice

The findings suggest that leaders in social service agencies committed to trauma-informed organizational change using the Sanctuary Model practice a transformational leadership style. In addition, leaders with extensive experience implementing the model reported being able to clearly identify unique aspects of organizational culture within their agencies, such as levels of safety, and they were able to envision culture as not only a barrier to organizational change, but also as a facilitator to trauma-informed organizational change. This juxtaposed perception allowed the leaders to see beyond barriers and create buy-in among key staff and stakeholders, promoting successful implementation.

When leaders described their experiences implementing the model, the themes coalesced into the four transformational leadership characteristics, seemingly useful when implementing organizational change: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Given the emphasis transformational leadership places on the importance of an organization's mission and outcomes, as well as embedded principles of participatory leadership, empowerment, and proaction, this style of leadership may be particularly useful in human service organizations, as such organizations have strong service- and community-oriented missions. Similarly, transformational leadership enables the creation of an infrastructure that influences organizational factors, processes, and expectations, for the sake of facilitating the sustainability of EBPs. The Sanctuary Model's Seven Commitments and Tool Kit are very much aligned with transformational leadership. As social service organizations must learn to adjust to changing social, cultural, economic, political, and demographic factors, tools need to be identified, such as the Sanctuary Model, that can be used by leadership to facilitate effective organizational change.

References

- Austin, D. (1997). The profession of social work: In the second century. In M. Reisch & E. Gambrill (Eds.), *Social work in the 21st century* (pp. 396–407). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Bargal, D., & Schmid, H. (1989). Recent themes in theory and research on leadership and their implications for management of the human services. *Administration in Social Work, 13*(3/4), 37–54.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19–31.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 181–217.
- Bloom, S. L. (2005). The Sanctuary Model of trauma-informed organizational change. *The Source, 16*(1). Retrieved from http://www.sanctuaryweb.com/PDFs_new/Bloom%20The%20Sanctuary%20Model%20The%20Source%20Articles%20Sanctuary.pdf
- Bloom, S. L. (2011). *Trauma-informed means changing organizational culture*. Sanctuary Model [Website]. Retrieved from <http://www.sanctuaryweb.com/trauma-informed-systems.php>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London, UK: SAGE.
- Cooke, P., Reid, P., & Edwards, R. (1997). Management: New developments and directions. In R. L. Edwards (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social work supplement 1997* (19th ed., pp. 229–242). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Esaki, N., Benamati, J., Yanosy, S., Middleton, J. S., Hopson, L. M., Hummer, V. L., & Bloom, S. L. (2013). The Sanctuary Model: Theoretical framework. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 94*(2), 87–95. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.4287
- Esaki, N., & Elwyn, L. J. (2013). *Exploring the impact of the Sanctuary Model in a female juvenile justice facility*. Paper presented at the Children's Mental Health Research & Policy Conference, Tampa, FL.
- Everett, L. Q., & Sitterding, M. C. (2011). Transformational leadership required to design and sustain evidence-based practice: A system exemplar. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 33*(3), 398–426. doi:10.1177/0193945910383056
- Fisher, E. A. (2009). Motivation and leadership in social work management: A review of theories and related studies. *Administration in Social Work, 33*(4), 347–367. doi:10.1080/03643100902769160
- Frontiera, J. (2010). Leadership and organizational culture transformation in professional sport. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 17*(1), 71–86. doi:10.1177/1548051809345253
- Gavan O'Shea, P., Foti, R. J., Hauenstein, N. M. A., & Bycio, P. (2009). Are the best leaders both transformational and transactional? A pattern-oriented analysis. *Leadership, 5*(2), 237–259. doi:10.1177/1742715009102937
- Gellis, Z. D. (2001). Social work perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership in health care. *Social Work Research, 25*(1), 17.
- Kanter, R. M. (2004). *Confidence: Leadership and the psychology of turnarounds*. New York, NY: Random House Business Books.
- Kays, D. (1993). *An investigation of transformational and transactional leadership styles in personal social service organizations* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Wilfred Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Kelloway, E. K., Turner, N., Barling, J., & Loughlin, C. (2012). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: The mediating role of employee trust in leadership. *Work & Stress, 26*(1), 39–55. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.660774>
- Kotter, J. P., & Heskett, J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic theory*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Mary, N. L. (2005). Transformational leadership in human service organizations. *Administration in Social Work, 29*(2), 105–118.
- McDonald, C., & Chenoweth, L. (2009). Leadership: A crucial ingredient in unstable times. *Social Work and Society International Online Journal, 7*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.socwork.net/sws/article/view/47/349>

- National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (2008). *Trauma-informed interventions. Sanctuary Model: General information*. Retrieved from http://www.nctsn.org/nctsn_assets/pdfs/promising_practices/Sanctuary_General.pdf
- Packard, T. (2004). The supervisor as transformational leader. In M. Austin & K. Hopkins (Eds.), *Supervision as collaboration in the human services* (pp. 151–163). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Rank, M. G., & Hutchison, W. S. (2000). An analysis of leadership within the social work profession. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(3), 487–502.
- Rivard, J. C., Bloom, S. L., McCorkle, D., & Abramovitz, R. (2005). Preliminary results of a study examining the implementation and effects of a trauma recovery framework for youths in residential treatment. *Therapeutic Community: The International Journal for Therapeutic and Supportive Organizations, 26*(1), 83–96.
- Smith, M. A. (2011). Are you a transformational leader? *Nursing Management, 42*(9), 44–50. doi: 10.1097/01.NUMA.0000403279.04379.6a
- Stoesz, D. (1997). The end of social work. In M. Reisch & E. Gambrill (Eds.), *Social work in the 21st century* (pp. 368–375). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Tafvelin, S., Hyvönen, U., & Westerberg, K. (2014). Transformational leadership in the social work context: The importance of leader continuity and co-worker support. *British Journal of Social Work, 44*(4), 886–904. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcs174
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1991). Cultural leadership in organizations. *Organization Science, 2*(2), 149–169.
- Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management, 36*(2), 223–270. doi: 10.1177/1059601111401017
- Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review, 72*(2), 206–215. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x

Jennifer Middleton, PhD, LCSW, assistant professor, University of Louisville, Kent School of Social Work. **Sarah Harvey**, MSW, research assistant, University of Maine. **Nina Esaki**, PhD, MBA, MSW, director of research, Sanctuary Institute, ANDRUS. Correspondence: jennifer.s.middleton@gmail.com; University of Louisville, Kent School of Social Work, Louisville, KY 40292.

Authors' note. We extend our gratitude to the nonprofit agency leaders we interviewed, for their time and willingness to share their thoughts about Sanctuary Model implementation. This study would not have been possible without their generous contributions.

Manuscript received: August 24, 2014

Revised: March 30, 2015

Accepted: April 7, 2015

Disposition editor: Jessica Strolin-Goltzman

Alliance

Human Services Compensation in the United States: 2015

The 2015 report focuses on 60 licensed/credentialed professionals, direct service and program staff, administrative and support staff positions, and the CEO/Top Executive position by organization budget size, organization staffing size, and geographic region.

Copies of this report can be ordered online at: store.alliance1.org or by calling the Alliance Evaluation and Research Services Department at 414-359-6537.



Evaluation and Research Services
Alliance for Strong Families and Communities
11700 W. Lake Park Drive, Milwaukee, WI 53224
414-359-6537 | uscompensation@alliance1.org


Alliance
for Strong Families
and Communities