



This is a repository copy of *The impact of group efficacy beliefs and transformational leadership on followers' self-efficacy : a multilevel-longitudinal study*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/158927/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Salanova, M., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A.M. and Nielsen, K. [orcid.org/0000-0001-9685-9570](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9685-9570)  
(2020) The impact of group efficacy beliefs and transformational leadership on followers' self-efficacy : a multilevel-longitudinal study. *Current Psychology*. ISSN 1046-1310

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00722-3>

---

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in *Current Psychology*. The final authenticated version is available online at:  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00722-3>.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



This is a repository copy of *The Impact of Group Efficacy Beliefs and Transformational Leadership on Followers' Self-efficacy: A Multilevel-Longitudinal Study*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/158927/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Salanova, M, Rodriguez, A and Nielsen, K [orcid.org/0000-0001-9685-9570](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9685-9570) (Accepted: 2020) *The Impact of Group Efficacy Beliefs and Transformational Leadership on Followers' Self-efficacy: A Multilevel-Longitudinal Study*. *Current Psychology*. pp. 1-38. ISSN 1046-1310 (In Press)

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Running head: EFFICACY BELIEFS AND LEADERSHIP

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**The Impact of Group Efficacy Beliefs and Transformational Leadership on  
Followers' Self-efficacy: A Multilevel-Longitudinal Study**

## Abstract

1  
2 Using Social Cognitive Theory as our theoretical framework, we analyse how beliefs  
3  
4 about group efficacy among team members, together with transformational leadership  
5  
6 are two group-level constructs (aggregated members' shared beliefs), which predicts  
7  
8 individual members self-efficacy over time. We conducted a three-wave longitudinal  
9  
10 study with 456 participants that were randomly distributed in 112 groups working in  
11  
12 three simulated creative collective tasks. We computed random coefficient models in a  
13  
14 lagged-effects design. Findings were as expected and group efficacy beliefs and group-  
15  
16 level transformational leadership were relevant cross-level predictors of individual self-  
17  
18 efficacy over time (even after controlling for baseline levels of individual self-efficacy).  
19  
20 Results suggested that these group-level factors are relevant cross-level constructs that  
21  
22 explain how individual self-efficacy among group members is developed over time.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Key words: Group efficacy beliefs, transformational leadership, individual self-efficacy,  
32  
33  
34 multilevel analysis, longitudinal design.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## **The Impact of Group Efficacy Beliefs and Transformational Leadership on Followers' Self-efficacy: A Multilevel-Longitudinal Study**

For decades, psychological research showed about the positive benefits of self-efficacy on performance (Lisbona et al., 2018; Peterson et al., 2011; Schneider & Preckel, 2017; Stajkovic, Lee, & Nyberg, 2009; Talsma, Schüz, & Norris, 2019) and well-being (Buric & Macuka, 2018; Guarnaccia, et al., 2018; Nielsen & Munir, 2009; Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011), to name just a few. Research is clear that self-efficacy helps people (employees, students, etc.) to manage their task/job demands and motivates them to be more engaged in their jobs, leading to better performance and feelings of positive subjective well-being.

However, most of this self-efficacy literature has focused almost exclusively on one level of analysis, i.e. self-efficacy or collective efficacy beliefs and their consequences (i.e., performance and/or well-being). Less is known about multilevel drivers of self-efficacy. For example, is there a contagion effect such that when the group feels efficacious, the individual members can feel self-efficacious as well? Or does a transformational leader make us believe in our ability to successfully manage specific challenges in our activity?

Given that groups have become the basic unit of work organization and work accomplishment (Hirschfeld & Bernerth, 2008), the answer to these questions is necessary in order to know how to build future self-efficacy by means of group features such as collective efficacy and leadership. Thus, in the current study, we will test whether group collective efficacy beliefs and transformational leadership (two group-based psychosocial constructs) can explain future levels of self-efficacy, above and beyond previous levels of group members' self-efficacy. We intend to increase the

1 understanding of the processes involved in the complex (i.e., group, multilevel)  
2 predictors of individual self-efficacy over time. Moreover, we investigate how group-  
3 level shared perceptions of transformational leadership can be cross-level antecedents of  
4 individual self-efficacy over time. Therefore, we perform a multilevel and longitudinal  
5 study in order to understand the cross-level dynamics of these psychological  
6 experiences over time.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

### 13 **Group efficacy beliefs and self-efficacy**

14  
15  
16 According to Bandura (1997), collective efficacy beliefs are “shared beliefs in  
17 group capacities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given  
18 attainments” (p. 447). Research carried out in organizations demonstrates that when  
19 individuals cooperate, they may share convictions and attitudes thus showing  
20 comparable persuasive and personal conduct standards (George, 1990, 1996)  
21 furthermore, encountering a common group emotional tone (Barsade, 2002; Bartel &  
22 Saavedra, 2000). A developing group of research accentuates the effect (e.g. affective,  
23 motivational and, behavioural effects) of perceived collective efficacy on group  
24 processes (Alavi, & McCormick, 2018; Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi, & Beaubien, 2002;  
25 Nielsen & Daniels, 2012; Salanova, et al., 2003; Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011;  
26 Stajkovic, Lee, & Nyberg, 2009).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Moreover, Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) identifies four predictors of efficacy  
45 beliefs: enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social influence through  
46 verbal persuasion, and (positive/negative) affective states. According to Bandura, (2001,  
47 2012), research indicates that performing a challenging task (i.e. mastery experience)  
48 can improve people’s self-efficacy beliefs. In addition, self-efficacy is affected by  
49 vicarious learning, which takes place when people observe efficacious people (working  
50 individually or in teams) performing a similar task. According to Bandura, the more  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 noteworthy the apparent similitude between the role model and the objective individual,  
2 the more prominent the model's effect on the individual's self-efficacy will be. Verbal  
3 influence through social persuasion, for example, by positive leaders, is another  
4 mechanism to improve self-efficacy. Finally, the fourth major source of self-efficacy  
5 consists of (positive/negative) affects. For example, when individuals feel eager or  
6 fulfilled, they are likely to trust that they are useful and efficacious as well.  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14       According to the SCT, and at the collective level, we could expect that when a  
15 group shares efficacy beliefs about good group performance (enactive mastery and  
16 vicarious experiences), they could feel more efficacious as individuals due to  
17 psychological mechanisms such as positive emotional contagion, defined by Hatfield,  
18 Cacioppo, and Rapson (1994, p.5) as the “tendency to automatically mimic and  
19 synchronize facial expressions, vocalizations, postures and movements with those of  
20 another person and, consequently, to converge emotionally”. This emotional contagion  
21 has been applied to many contexts, including organizations and, specifically, research  
22 on teams and leadership processes (Tee, 2015; Torrente, Salanova & Llorens, 2013).  
23 We could expect that when group members feel efficacious, they also potentially  
24 exchange other positive emotions, such as joy, satisfaction, or pride in a job well done.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

101       It is important to understand whether collective beliefs of efficacy have  
102 crossed effects on individual self-efficacy over time and previous research has not  
103 studied these effects. A collective shared perception that a group feels efficacious in  
104 obtaining a specific goal could encourage each individual's beliefs that s/he can achieve

1 the goal/s as well (“If my group can, so can I”). We expect that individuals who work in  
2 a group where members believe that they have the capabilities to achieve group goals  
3 may, over time, come to believe that they can achieve their individual goals as well.  
4 Thus, we expect to find a positive relationship between collective efficacy and  
5 individual self-efficacy over time.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 Hypothesis 1: Group-level collective efficacy at T2 has a significant cross-level  
12 effect on individual self-efficacy at T3, above and beyond previous levels of self-  
13 efficacy at T2 and at T1.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Shared transformational leadership perceptions and individual self-efficacy**

20 Transformational leaders develop close inter-relationships with collaborators  
21 minimizing the distance between leaders and collaborators, in spite of “their ability”,  
22 and by individualized beliefs about members’ needs and abilities (Bass, 1990). This  
23 relationship is based on trust between leaders and followers, transparent  
24 communication, and empathy between leaders and followers, thus potentially enhancing  
25 their individual efficacy beliefs through vicarious experiences and social persuasion  
26 (Walumbwa et al., 2011). In this regard, leaders’ behaviours influence cognitions,  
27 emotions, and behaviours of followers. Leggod, Thomas and Sacramento (2016)  
28 recently showed that leaders’ trustworthy behaviour influenced organizational trust via  
29 trustworthiness perceptions and followers’ trust in their leaders. Research suggests that  
30 a positive leadership style may exert its influence on followers through other  
31 psychological mechanisms such as self-efficacy (Stetz, Stetz, & Bliese, 2006). For  
32 example, Pillai and Williams (2004) found that transformational leadership was related  
33 to followers’ self-efficacy in a sample of American fire service organizations. Salanova,  
34 Lorente, Chambel and Martínez (2011) found a direct path between transformational  
35 leaders and nurses’ self-efficacy in 280 dyads (supervisors and nurses). Moreover, in a  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 sample of nurses, Afsar and Masood (2018) demonstrated that creative nurses' self-  
2 efficacy is a psychological mechanism (in interaction with others such as trust in  
3 supervisor and uncertainty avoidance) that explained how transformations leadership,  
4 influenced on nurse's innovative job behaviour.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 According to SCT, enactive mastery is an important antecedent of self-efficacy  
10 (Bandura, 1997), which depends on previous success on similar tasks. Other important  
11 antecedents of self-efficacy may include social persuasion, vicarious experiences, and  
12 positive affect, all of these strategies may be employed by positive leaders (Sivanathan,  
13 Arnold, Turner, & Barling, 2004). In this regard, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and  
14 Fetter (1990) showed that transformational leaders influence collaborators' self-efficacy  
15 because leaders are modelling the right behaviours and followers identify with leaders  
16 through observational learning. Transformational leaders may improve followers' self-  
17 efficacy when they express high expectations that followers can successfully overcome  
18 difficulties (the Pygmalion effect, Eden, 1990). Transformational leaders also affect  
19 their collaborators' sense of efficacy through intellectual stimulation when they  
20 encourage followers to develop solutions to the challenges they face, rather than  
21 suggesting solutions themselves, thus encouraging followers to find better ways of  
22 doing things (Sivanathan et al., 2004).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 A group's perception that they have a transformational leader who encourages  
44 trust, empathy, and authenticity (social persuasion) may contribute to enhancing the  
45 individual efficacy beliefs of the followers. Research has found that positive leadership  
46 behaviours (i.e., transformational, authentic, ethic...) predicted collaborators' self-  
47 efficacy (Afsar, & Masood, 2018; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Kark, Shamir,  
48 & Chen, 2003; Nielsen & Munir, 2009; Wallumbwa, et al., 2011). In his review, Tee  
49 (2015) also showed that emotional contagion processes are developed from bottom-up  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 through intra-individual and between-individual factors to top-down from leaders to  
2 followers affecting to different organizational outcomes (Barsade & Knight, 2015).  
3

4 Furthermore, based on emotional contagion as an explanatory mechanism and  
5 the fourth source of individual self-efficacy, research has shown the effect of how the  
6 moods of leaders influence on group positive affect. Chi, Chung, and Tsai (2011)  
7 showed that these positive leader emotions influence the group's positive affect. Also,  
8 group positive affect is associated with job performance and, in turn, on individual self-  
9 efficacy (Seong & Cho, 2014; Zhang, et al., 2017).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Research on the way transformational leaders influence group members' self-  
20 efficacy has mainly used a single level of analysis, i.e. the individual level. Thus,  
21 individual perceptions of leaders were linked to individual self-efficacy. For example,  
22 Liu, Siu and Shi (2010) showed that transformational leaders influence individual  
23 followers' self-efficacy and, in turn, employee well-being. According to Yammarino,  
24 Dionne, Chun, and Dansereau, (2005), previous research on transformational leadership  
25 has neglected the consideration of transformational leadership as a group/organizational  
26 factor as well. For example, how a leader relates to a group of followers or shared  
27 perceptions among the group members (i.e. within-group agreement) about how  
28 transformational their leader is. As far as we know, no multilevel studies have examined  
29 how shared perceptions of group members about transformational leadership (group  
30 level of analysis) are linked to individual self-efficacy (individual level of analysis)  
31 across levels. It is important to note that, in the study by Wallumbwa et al, (2011), an  
32 aggregated measure of ethical leadership was linked to followers' self-efficacy. In our  
33 study, we take a step forward by including not only aggregated leadership, but also  
34 collective efficacy, as multilevel predictors of individual self-efficacy, using a  
35 longitudinal design. In their meta-analysis on transformational leadership, Wang, Oh,  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Courtright and Colbert (2011, p. 255) urged researchers to examine the “differential  
2 effects of transformational leadership on performance across levels of analysis  
3 should ideally be examined using the same sample following multilevel analysis  
4 principles (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000) to ensure that differences in effect sizes  
5 across levels of analysis are attributable to differences in levels of analysis alone”.

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 Based on previous research, we expect that:

13  
14 Hypothesis 2: Shared perceptions of transformational leadership at T2 have a  
15 significant cross-level effect on individual self-efficacy at T3, above and beyond  
16 previous levels of self-efficacy at T2 and T1.

## 21 Method

### 22 Sample and Procedure

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 A three-wave longitudinal laboratory study was carried out with 481 participants  
28 randomly distributed in 118 small groups and involved in three group tasks. Participants  
29 were recruited via a website the research group created for this purpose, as well as  
30 through ads posted on notice sheets around the college and in the city where the  
31 university is located. Participation in the study was voluntary. Participants were  
32 informed that the purpose of this study was to know more about how groups work in the  
33 context of creative tasks. For the purposes of the study, each group had a leader. These  
34 leaders (who were part of each group) were assigned using the same criterion for all the  
35 groups, i.e., status depending on age. The oldest member (highest status) of each group  
36 was designated as the leader at the beginning of the study. Before beginning the tasks,  
37 all the groups received the same instructions for the tasks and the leader’s role.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Participants were randomly assigned to each group. To guarantee cooperation on the three tasks and avoid dropouts, members received a monetary reward (20 €) for their participation in the study.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Because the measurement referent for two variables (i.e. group efficacy beliefs and perception of transformational leadership) is the group, agreement indices were performed in order that all the groups shared similar perceptions of the study variables. Six groups with low agreement were excluded from the beginning. So sum up, 456 individuals nested in 112 groups (ranging from four to six members each) are the final participants in the study.

The final sample was a heterogeneous mixed sample consisting of 66% females, with an average age of 22.5 years. They were university students (80%) from different degree programmes (Law, Design, Engineering, Languages, Economics, Chemistry, Psychology, Business Management, Teaching and Educational Sciences), full-time workers (11.6%) representing different occupations, and the unemployed (8.4%). Participants were allocated to one of the 112 groups in such a way as to ensure that the groups have similar size (i.e. ranging from four to six) and diversity (i.e. similar combinations of students, employed/unemployed people).

Groups were working together during the three laboratory occasions, one time per week in three consecutive weeks. Moreover, each group worked on three creativity tasks (one different creative task per week) in order to avoid learning effects, (Ziessler & Nattkemper, 2001). Tasks were not complex and involved a unified creative project for two weeks with three face-to-face meetings among the group members. These three specific tasks, as well as the need to achieve a final group product, were chosen to promote important social interactions among group members, group decisions, feelings of efficacy (or not) during the three specific tasks, and the opportunity for leaders to interact with group members. Past research has used creative tasks that were accomplished in three similar time periods (Peñalver et al., 2018; Rodríguez-Sánchez, et al., 2017; Salanova, et al., 2003). At time 1 (T1), groups had to (imaginatively) work for

1 a toy company. During each of the three sessions, participants would perform a creative  
2 task for 45 minutes. In the first session (T1), they worked on an idea generation task  
3  
4 (i.e., a creative slogan). Next lab session (T2), they worked on another creative task,  
5  
6 which was to develop a toy prototype composed of recyclable materials. One week later  
7  
8 (T3), they designed a poster to market this toy. Upon completing each task, participants,  
9  
10 they completed a questionnaire.  
11  
12

### 13 **Measures**

14  
15  
16 **Transformational Leadership** was assessed by the validated Transformational  
17  
18 Leadership Scale (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), with five dimensions. Vision (three items,  
19  
20 e.g. “As a leader, I am perfectly aware of the group’s objectives”); Inspirational  
21  
22 communication (three items, e.g. “As a leader, I say positive things about the group”);  
23  
24 Intellectual stimulation (three items, e.g. “As a leader, I have ideas that stimulate group  
25  
26 members to think about questions they had never thought about before”); Support (three  
27  
28 items, e.g. “As a leader, I think about the personal needs of the group members”); and  
29  
30 Personal recognition (three items, e.g. “As a leader, I congratulate group members when  
31  
32 they do an excellent job”). Items were answered on a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from  
33  
34 0 (never) to 6 (always). Group members had to assess their leader’s transformational  
35  
36 style, and so the referent was the leader (level 2). We used transformational leadership  
37  
38 at level II because it included the aggregated scores of all the members of each group  
39  
40 related to their individual perceptions of each dimension of transformational leadership.  
41  
42 We used a single scale of transformational leadership, and not its highly intercorrelated  
43  
44 sub-components, as recommended by Bass (1999).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 **Collective efficacy** was assessed by a scale composed of 4 items, following  
54  
55 Bandura’s guidelines (validated by Salanova et al., 2003), and adapted to creative tasks  
56  
57  
58 in the same way as the self-efficacy scale. Thus, the collective efficacy scale is specific  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 rather than general, i.e., creative collective efficacy. An example of an item is “My  
2 group can carry out this creative task despite not being familiar with this kind of task”.  
3  
4 Items were answered on a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always).  
5  
6 Group members had to evaluate their group’s perception of collective efficacy, so that  
7  
8 the referent was the group and not the individual. Hence, collective efficacy was  
9  
10 measured at the group level (level 2).  
11  
12

13  
14 **Individual self-efficacy** was assessed by a scale composed of 4 items, following  
15  
16 Bandura’s ideas (validated in Salanova et al., 2003), but using “I” instead of “We” in  
17  
18 order to evaluate “individual” self-efficacy. Thus, the self-efficacy scale is specific  
19  
20 rather than general, i.e., creative self-efficacy. An example of an item is “I can carry out  
21  
22 this creative task even though I am not familiar with this kind of task”. Items were  
23  
24 answered on a 7-point Likert-scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always). Each member  
25  
26 of the group had to evaluate his/her own self-efficacy belief, and so the referent is the  
27  
28 individual (level 1).  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 We use age, gender, and previous levels of individual self-efficacy as control  
35  
36 variables in our research model because previous research is inconclusive about self-  
37  
38 efficacy differences in different settings. Some studies have shown age (Bausch,  
39  
40 Michel, & Sonntag, 2014; Fukudome, & Morinaga, 2018; Grau, Salanova, & Peiró,  
41  
42 2001; Schweder, 2018) and gender differences (Beauregard, 2012; Huang, 2013;  
43  
44 Huszczo, & Endres, 2017; Ye, Posada, & Liu, 2018), whereas other studies failed to  
45  
46 find differences (Beas, & Salanova, 2006; Salanova, Peiró, & Schaufeli, 2002). We also  
47  
48 included baseline levels of individual self-efficacy in T1 in order to control previous  
49  
50 variance in this variable.  
51  
52  
53

## 54 **Data analysis**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

First, we computed descriptive analyses with the study variables. Furthermore, to assess the convergent validity of the scales, the composite reliability (CR) level was calculated (Chin, 1998). According to Nunnally (1967), CR should be greater than 0.7. Moreover, discriminant validity was checked by using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), being acceptable when it is greater than 0.5 (Chin, 1998). Second, because some of the study variables are collective, to test whether the group members showed sufficient agreement on the variables (i.e. group efficacy beliefs and perceived transformational leadership), we examined several indicators of within-group consensus, such as the  $r_{wg}$  index of within-group agreement (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1993) and the intra-class correlation coefficients ICC(1) (Bliese, 2000; Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). Values higher than .12 for ICC1 indicate an adequate level of within-unit agreement (James et al., 1984). ICC2 values greater than .60 were recommended by Glick (1985).  $r_{wg(j)}$  cut-off point values ranging between .51 and .70 have moderate, and values between .71 to .90 strong agreements (LeBreton & Senter, 2007). So far, these indices support the individual responses aggregation at the next (group) level.

Third, our data are hierarchical because participants were nested within groups and within leaders. Hence, we used hierarchical linear modelling (HLM; Hox, 2002) to test the hypotheses. We can add multilevel predictors and improve the model, considering that a previous model could be tested taking into account a likelihood ratio statistic (Hox, 2002). In our study, we controlled for the effects of previous self-efficacy (T1 as baseline and T2) to investigate the influence of T2 collective efficacy and T2 transformational leadership on T3 self-efficacy. To compute multilevel analyses, we used MLwiN 2.02 software (Rashbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2005).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Finally, all the variables, except the dummy variables (gender and age), were grand-mean centred for the model estimation (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992).

## Results

### Descriptive and aggregation analyses

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, bivariate correlations, internal consistencies (Cronbach's alpha), and convergent (CR) and discriminant validity (AVE) for all the variables in the study. All the Cronbach's alpha coefficients met the criterion value of .70 (ranging from .83 to .97), and the variables met the criterion for convergent and discriminant validity (CR values greater than 0.7 and AVE values greater than 0.5). As expected, all the study variables were positively and significantly related to self-efficacy at T3 and to the rest of our study variables. Based on Cohen's (1988) convention to interpret effect sizes, all the variables related to self-efficacy at T3 had a moderate to strong correlation. Finally, mean values (and standard deviations) of the collective measures were 4.60 (0.60) for group efficacy beliefs and 4.42 (0.75) for shared transformational leadership.

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Regarding the aggregation of our study variables, the ICC1 value for T2 collective efficacy was .24; the T2 transformational leadership ICC1 value was: .38; the ICC2 value for T2 collective efficacy was .58; and for T2 transformational leadership, the value was .71. The mean  $r_{wg(j)}$  value for T2 collective efficacy at the group level was .81 (SD = .11), and for T2 transformational leadership, it was .73 (SD = .13). This means there is strong agreement on both variables, according to the cut-off points of LeBreton and Senter (2007). Hence, given the satisfactory ICC1, ICC2 (except T2 collective efficacy, for which the ICC2 was .58, but very close to .60), and  $r_{wg(j)}$  values, we aggregated at the group level the variables of the present study.



### Hypothesis testing

We calculated the intraclass correlation for the study variables to estimate the proportion of variance explained at each level studied (Hox, 2002). The results showed that 71% of the variance in T3 self-efficacy is explained by variables from the individual, and 29% from the group levels. These results suggests that a significant proportion of T3 self-efficacy variance may be explained by group-level variables (group efficacy beliefs and shared transformational leadership).

Then we tested 3 nested models, i.e., Model 0 intercept-only; Model 1, in which we added the variables at the first level, including the control variables age, gender, T1 self-efficacy, and T2 self-efficacy; and Model 2, with second level variables (i.e, T2 group efficacy beliefs and T2 shared transformational leadership). Table 2 presents unstandardized estimates, standard errors, t values and the deviance ( $-2*\log$ ).

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Results showed that Model 1 is better than Model 0. Variables at the individual level (T1 and T2 self-efficacy) are significantly related to T3 self-efficacy, and gender and age had no significant effect on T3 self-efficacy. In Model 2, we tested predictor variables at the group level, and T2 group efficacy beliefs and T2 shared transformational leadership were found to exert a significant effect on T3 self-efficacy. According the deviance levels, there is a significant improvement over Model 1. Thus, Model 2 got the better fit, showing significant effects of both individual (i.e. T1 and T2 self-efficacy) and group variables (i.e., T2 group efficacy beliefs, T2 shared transformational leadership) on the development of future self-efficacy (at T3). In other words, perceived collective efficacy of the group and perceived transformational leadership at T2 predicted participants' self-efficacy at T3, and these relationships were

1  
2 significant beyond previous levels (T1 and T2) of individual self-efficacy (thus  
3 confirming our hypotheses) (see the multilevel model in Figure 1).

4  
5 PLEASE INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE  
6

### 7 8 **Discussion** 9

10 The present study builds on our understanding of the role of “collective” sources  
11 of individual self-efficacy over time, i.e. shared group perceptions of transformational  
12 leadership and group efficacy beliefs, extending the Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura,  
13 1998, 2001, 2012). The study expands our understanding about what are relevant  
14 indicators that explain the development of individual self-efficacy over time, providing  
15 support for the idea that collective efficacy and leadership together play a relevant role  
16 as group-level drivers of the development of individual self-efficacy over time. The  
17 results simultaneously show the effects of collective psychosocial mechanisms on self-  
18 efficacy over time.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 The study demonstrates a comprehensive multilevel and longitudinal model of  
32 the interplay between collective (group) antecedents or drivers of individual self-  
33 efficacy involving cross-level links between the group and individual levels of analysis.  
34 Previous research has shown that sources of self-efficacy, such as enactive mastery,  
35 social persuasion, positive emotions and vicarious experiences are able to influence  
36 efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 2001, 2012), but our findings extend previous literature on  
37 antecedents of self-efficacy from a multilevel perspective, by considering the dynamics  
38 of changes in self-efficacy over time. In this regard, the main study contributions reside  
39 in empirically testing the idea that the group may be responsible for building self-  
40 efficacy. In other words, working in an efficacious group helps to build the future self-  
41 efficacy of its members. Previous research has focused on individual effects of self-  
42 efficacy (Bandura, 2012; Buric & Macuka, 2018; Guarnaccia, et al., 2018; Lisbona et  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

al., 2018; Peterson et al., 2011; Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011; Schneider & Preckel, 2017; Stajkovic, Lee, & Nyberg, 2009; Talsma, Schütz, & Norris, 2019) or collective predictors of collective efficacy beliefs (Alavi, & McCormick, 2018; Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi, & Beaubien, 2002; Nielsen & Daniels, 2012; Salanova, et al., 2003; Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011; Stajkovic, Lee, & Nyberg, 2009). Our findings confirm that individual self-efficacy can be explained by group variables (perhaps through emotional contagion) such as shared collective efficacy beliefs and shared perceptions of positive leaders. Our results support the Tee (2015) study, which stressed that emotional contagion processes are developed not only bottom-up, but also top-down where leadership processes are relevant as well. Future studies could test these emotional mechanisms more in-depth.

The results of this study yield a number of theoretical implications. The finding that group efficacy beliefs are a significant cross-level predictor of individual self-efficacy over time supports the importance of the group's beliefs about their efficacy because a group is a driver of each individual's efficacy beliefs over time. According to Bandura, emotional expression is a very valuable source of self-efficacy. Future research should test the mediating role of positive emotions at the group and individual levels of analysis as a psychological mechanism to explain why group efficacy beliefs can influence individual self-efficacy over time.

Another interesting theoretical implication has to do with the way positive leaders encourage collaborators' advancement and strength, in a way of expanding their capabilities and inspiration (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). Transformational leaders use their inspirational motivation influencing collaborators' self-efficacy by setting clear goals for their followers and communicating a positive better future. In addition, these leaders could improve their collaborators' self-esteem because they use an

1 individualized consideration of each one. In our study, we found that transformational  
2 leaders increased individual self-efficacy over time, as these leaders functioned as role  
3 models and applied verbal persuasion strategies through individualized consideration  
4 and inspirational motivation (Felfe & Heinitz, 2010).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Prochazka, Gilova, and Vaculik (2017) suggested that factors such as feedback  
10 from customers and colleagues, and work performance could affect self-efficacy. In our  
11 study, we showed that there are other drivers of individual self-efficacy apart from  
12 transformational leadership, such as group collective efficacy beliefs in combination  
13 with baseline levels of previous self-efficacy levels.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Our findings have important practical implications, they suggest managers need  
22 to be made aware of how they influence others' efficacy beliefs over time. Idealized  
23 influence may be a mechanism that leads group members to feel more efficacious as  
24 employees of a company. Through intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders  
25 motivate followers to achieve new inspiring goals at work in the future. In fact, previous  
26 research has established a link between self-efficacy and future job performance  
27 (Lisbona et al., 2018; Peterson et al., 2011; Schneider & Preckel, 2017; Stajkovic, Lee,  
28 & Nyberg, 2009; Talsma, Schütz, & Norris, 2019). Therefore, it is important for  
29 companies to understand the drivers of self-efficacy in order to enhance employees'  
30 self-efficacy beliefs and improve their performance. Our findings highlight the  
31 importance of developing individual self-efficacy as a powerful psychological resource  
32 to achieve goals at work and improve performance.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 We strongly recommend that leaders develop a transformational style in order  
52 to enhance the individual self-efficacy of their followers. Specific healthy practices,  
53 such as open dialogue with followers through an empathic attitude, group training  
54 showing leaders how to engage in these positive behaviours, individual interactions  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 with followers with a compassionate attitude encouraging leaders to enact positive  
2 behaviours with their groups, and getting feedback from group members, may help  
3  
4 managers adopt a transformational style with positive benefits for leaders, followers,  
5  
6 and companies.  
7

8  
9 In addition, the positive cross-level influence of group collective efficacy  
10 beliefs on individual efficacy beliefs over time is an important finding in SCT because it  
11  
12 seems that some of the variance in individual self-efficacy is explained by more  
13  
14 collective (group) levels of shared efficacy beliefs about their own group.  
15  
16 Organizational practices oriented towards building a sense of “group identity” and  
17  
18 collective efficacy seem to be important to enhance individual perceptions of self-  
19  
20 efficacy over time.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 This study has provided some new insights into collective drivers of individual  
27  
28 self-efficacy over time, however it has some limitations. We included a heterogeneous  
29  
30 mixed sample of students, workers, and unemployed people, which limits  
31  
32 generalizability to specific companies or occupations. Another limitation is the use of  
33  
34 self-report measures. However, in our study we used psychological constructs such as  
35  
36 “beliefs”, and in these cases it is not appropriated to use objective data. In that cases, we  
37  
38 common-method bias could treat to our results, however, we followed Podsakoff,  
39  
40 MacKenzie and Podsakoff (2012) recommendations in constructing our survey in order  
41  
42 to minimize bias. Furthermore, we did not observe high correlations among the study  
43  
44 variables, and so common method variance is not a threat to our data (Spector, 2006).  
45  
46 Finally, using three creative tasks, we achieved the study objectives; however, our  
47  
48 results could be limited to creative tasks in groups, and replication of these findings  
49  
50 using other tasks should be carried out.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

## 57 Conclusion

58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 To sum up, this study furthers our understanding of the way group (collective)  
2 efficacy and shared perceptions of transformational leadership are linked to members  
3  
4 group' self-efficacy over time and in a group context. In addition, we showed cross-  
5  
6 level drivers of individual self-efficacy, and so our results add to SCT by enhancing our  
7  
8 understanding of the dynamic nature of the way shared group cognitions of collective  
9  
10 efficacy and leadership style are linked to self-efficacy over time. We believe our results  
11  
12 are a first step towards answering a key question in self-efficacy research, i.e. how  
13  
14 collective processes simultaneously influence individual self-efficacy over time.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Notes

### **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

### **Conflicts of Interest**

The corresponding author, and coauthors, states that there are no conflicts of interest.

### **Informed Consent**

We obtained the informed consent from all participants in the study.

### **Ethical Approval**

The procedures performed in our study involved human participants and they agreed the ethical standards of the institutional research committee, and also with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Afsar, B., & Masood, M. (2018). Transformational Leadership, Creative Self-Efficacy,  
6  
7 Trust in Supervisor, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Innovative Work Behavior of  
8  
9 Nurses. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 54(1), 36–  
10  
11 61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886317711891>  
12  
13  
14 Alavi, S.B. & McCormick, J. (2018). Why do I think my team is capable? A study of  
15  
16 some antecedents of team members' personal collective efficacy beliefs.  
17  
18 *Educational Psychology*, (38)9, 1147-1162.  
19  
20  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1500680>  
22  
23  
24 Bandura A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman, New York.  
25  
26  
27 Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of*  
28  
29 *Psychology*, 52, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1>  
30  
31  
32  
33 Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T.  
34  
35 Urdan (Eds.). *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents*, (Vol. 5., pp. 307-337).  
36  
37 Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.  
38  
39  
40  
41 Bandura, A. (2012). On the Functional Properties of Perceived Self-Efficacy Revisited.  
42  
43 *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 9-44.  
44  
45  
46 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606>  
47  
48  
49  
50 Barsade, S. G., & Knight, A. P. (2015). Group Affect. *Annual Review of Organizational*  
51  
52 *Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 21–46. [doi:10.1146/annurev-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111316)  
53  
54 [orgpsych-032414-111316](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111316)  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Barsade, S.G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(4), 644-675.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3094912>

Bartel, C.A., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(2), 197-231.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2667070>

Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-32.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)

Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–

32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410>

Bausch, S., Michel, A. & Sonntag, K. (2014). How gender influences the effect of age on self-efficacy and training success. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(3), 171-187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12027>

Beas, M.I., & Salanova, M. (2006). Self-efficacy Beliefs, Computer Training and Psychological Well-Being among Information and Communication Technology Workers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 22(6), 1043-1058.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.03.027>

Beauregard, T.A. (2012). Perfectionism, self-efficacy and OCB: the moderating role of gender. *Personnel Review*, 41(5), 590-

608. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211249120>

Bliese, P.D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analyses. In K. J. Klein & S.W.

1 Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations:*  
2 *Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp.349-381). San Francisco:  
3  
4 Jossey-Bass.  
5  
6

7 Bryk, A., & Raudenbush, S. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data*  
8 *analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.  
9

10  
11  
12 Buric, I., & Macuka, I. (2018). Self-efficacy, emotions and work engagement among  
13 teachers: A two wave cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*,  
14  
15 19(7), 1917-1933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9903-9>  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Chi, N.-W., Chung, Y.-Y., & Tsai, W.-C. (2011). How Do Happy Leaders Enhance  
22  
23 Team Success? The Mediating Roles of Transformational Leadership, Group  
24  
25 Affective Tone, and Team Processes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,  
26  
27 41(6), 1421–1454. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00767.x>  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling.  
33  
34 *Modern methods for business research*, 295(2), 295-336.  
35  
36

37  
38 Cohen, S. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S.  
39  
40 Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social*  
41  
42 *Psychology. The social psychology of health* (pp. 31-67). Thousand Oaks, CA, US:  
43  
44 Sage Publications, Inc.  
45  
46

47  
48  
49 Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B.J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational  
50  
51 leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment.  
52  
53 *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735–744.  
54  
55  
56 <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069307>  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Eden, D. (1990). *Pygmalion in Management: Productivity as a self-fulfilling prophecy.*

2           Lexington: D.C. Health.

3  
4 Felfe, J., & Heinitz, K. (2010). The impact of consensus and agreement of leadership

5           perceptions on commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and

6           customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

7           *Psychology*, 19(3), 279-303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320802708070>

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with

15           Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing*

16           *Research*, 18(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Fukudome, K., & Morinaga, Y. (2018). Age-related differences in the positive and

22           negative method factors on self-evaluation scales: The Rosenberg Self-Esteem

23           Scale and the Self-Efficacy Scale. *The Japanese Journal of Educational*

24           *Psychology*, 66(3), 212-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5926/jjep.66.212>

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Grau, R., Salanova, M., & Peiró, J. M. (2001). Moderator effects of self-efficacy on

32           occupational stress. *Psychology in Spain*, 5(1), 63-74.

33  
34  
35  
36 Guarnaccia, C.; Scrima, F.; Civilleri, A.; & Salerno, L. (2018). The role of

37           occupational self-efficacy in mediating the effect of job insecurity on

38           work engagement, satisfaction and general health. *Current Psychology*, 37(3),

39           488-497. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9525-0>

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Gully, S.M., Incalcaterra, K.A., Joshi, A., & Beaubien, J.M. (2002). A meta-analysis of

47           group efficacy, potency, and performance: Interdependence and level of

48           analysis as moderators of observed relationships. *Journal of Applied*

49           *Psychology*, 87(5), 819-832. [DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.5.819](https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.5.819)

50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J.T., & Rapson, R.L. (1993). *Emotional contagion.* Cambridge:

57           Cambridge University Press.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Bernerth, J. B. (2008). Mental efficacy and physical efficacy at the team level: Inputs and outcomes among newly formed action teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1429-1437. <http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0012574>
- Hofmann, D.A., Griffin, M.A., & Gavin, M.B. (2000). The application of hierarchical linear modeling to organizational research. In K. Klein & S. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations: Foundations, extensions, and new directions* (pp. 467-511). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hogg, M.A., Martin, R., Epitropaki, O., Mankad, A., Svensson, A., & Weeden, K. (2005). Effective leadership in salient group: revisiting leader-member exchange theory from the perspective of the social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(7), 991-1004. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204273098>
- Hox, J.J. (2002). *Multilevel analysis techniques and applications*. Manwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Huang, C. (2013). Gender differences in academic self-efficacy: a meta-analysis. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(1), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0097-y>
- Huszczko, G. & Endres, M. L. (2017). Gender differences in the importance of personality traits in predicting leadership self-efficacy. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 21(4), 304-317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12113>
- James, L.R., Demaree, R.G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(1), 85-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.1.85>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 246–255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246>
- Kozlowski, S.W.J. & Klein, K. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research on organizations: Contextual, temporal, and emergent processes. In K.J. Klein & S.W.J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp.3-90). San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.
- LeBreton, J.M. & Senter, J.L. (2007). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 815–852. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106296642>
- Legood, A., Thomas, G. & Sacramento, C. (2016). Leader trustworthy behavior and organizational trust: the role of the immediate manager for cultivating trust. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46(12), 673-686. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12394>
- Lisbona, A., Palací, F., Salanova, M. & Frese, M. (2018). The effects of work engagement and self-efficacy on personal initiative and performance. *Psicothema*, 30(1), 89-96. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=727/72754594014>
- Liu, J., Siu, O., & Shi, K. (2010). Transformational leadership and employee well-being: The mediating role of trust in the leader and self-efficacy. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59(3), 454-479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00407.x>
- Martínez, I., & Cifre, E. (2016). Individual and group antecedents of satisfaction: One lab- multilevel study. *Anales De Psicología / Annals of Psychology*, 32(2), 565-570. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.32.2.216801>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Nielsen, K. & Daniels, K. (2012). Does shared and differentiated transformational leadership predict followers' working conditions and well-being? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 383-397.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.001>
- Nielsen, K. & Munir, F. (2009). How do transformational leaders influence followers' affective well-being? Exploring the mediating role of self-efficacy. *Work & Stress*, 23(4), 313-329. [DOI: 10.1080/02678370903385106](https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370903385106)
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Peñalver, J., Salanova, M., Martínez, I. M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2019). Happy-productive groups: How positive affect links to performance through social resources. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(3), 377-392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1402076>
- Peterson, S. J., Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O. & Zhang, Z. (2011). Psychological capital and employee performance: A latent growth modeling approach. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 427–50.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01215.x>
- Pillai, R., & Williams, E.A. (2004). Transformational leadership, self-efficacy, group cohesiveness, commitment, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 144–159.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810410530584>
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990).

Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)

Prochazka, J., Gilova, H. & Vaculik, M. (2017). The Relationship Between

Transformational Leadership and Engagement: Self-Efficacy as a Mediator. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11(2), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21518>

Rafferty, A.E. & Griffin, M.A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership:

Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 329–354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009>

Rashbash, J., Browne, W., Healy, M., Cameron, B., & Charlton, C. (2005). MlwiN

(Version 2.02): Interactive software for multilevel analysis. *Multilevel Models Project*, Institute of Education, University of London: London.

Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., Devloo, T., Rico, R., Salanova, M., & Anseel, F. (2017).

What makes creative teams tick? Cohesion, engagement, and performance across creativity tasks: A three-wave study. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(4), 521-547. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601116636476>

Salanova, M., Llorens, S. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2011). Yes, I Can, I Feel Good & I Just

Do It! On Gain Cycles and Spirals of Efficacy Beliefs, Affect, and Engagement. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 60(2), 255-285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00435.x>

Salanova M, Llorens S, Cifre E, Martínez, I.M. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Perceived

collective efficacy, subjective well-being and task performance among electronic work groups: An experimental study. *Small Group Research* 34(1), 43–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496402239577>

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Salanova, M., Lorente, L., Chambel, M.J. & Martínez, I.M. (2011). Linking transformational leadership to nurses' extra-role performance: the mediating role of self-efficacy and work engagement. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 67(10), 2256–2266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05652.x>
- Salanova, M., Peiró, J.M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2002). Self-efficacy Specificity and Burnout among Information Technology Workers: An extension of the Job Demands-Control Model. *European Journal on Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000735>
- Schneider, M. & Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher education: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(6), 565-600. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bul0000098>
- Seong, J. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2014). Effects of Group-Level Fit on Group Conflict and Performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 39(2), 190–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113517138>
- Sivanathan, N., Arnold, K.A., Turner, N., & Barling, J. (2004). Leading well: Transformational leadership and well-being. In A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice* (pp. 241–255). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Spector, P.E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9(2), 221-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284955>
- Stajkovic, A.D., Lee, D., & Nyberg, A.J. (2009). Collective efficacy, group potency, and group performance: Meta-analyses of their relationships, and test of a mediation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(3), 814-828. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015659>



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Stetz, T.A., Stetz, M.C., & Bliese, P.A., (2006). The importance of self-efficacy in the moderating effects of social support on stressor-strain relationships. *Work & Stress*, 20(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370600624039>
- Schweder, S. (2018). The role of control strategies, self-efficacy, and learning behavior in self-directed learning. *International Journal of School & Educational Psychology*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21683603.2018.1459991>
- Talsma, K., Schüz, B. & Norris, K. (2019). Miscalibration of self-efficacy and academic performance: Self-efficacy ≠ self-fulfilling prophecy. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 69, 182-195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.11.002>
- Torrente, P., Salanova, M., & Llorens, S. (2013). Spreading engagement: On the role of similarity in the positive contagion of teamwork engagement. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(3), 153-159. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2013a21>
- Tee, E.Y.J. (2015). The emotional link: Leadership and the role of implicit and explicit emotional contagion processes across multiple organizational levels. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(4), 654-670. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.05.009>
- Wallumbwa, F.O., Mayer, D.M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K & Christensen, A.L. (2011). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader–member exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115(2), 204-213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.11.002>
- Wang, G., Oh, I., 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.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111401017>

Yammarino, F.J., Dionne, S.D., Chun, J.U., & Dansereau, F. (2005). Leadership and levels of analysis: A state-of-the-science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(6), 879-919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.09.002>

Ye, L.; Posada, A.; & Liu, Y. (2018). The moderating effects of gender on the relationship between academic stress and academic self-efficacy. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 25(1), 56-61.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/str0000089>

Zhang, L., Zhang, N., & Qiu, Y. (2017). Positive group affective tone and employee work engagement: A multilevel investigation. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 45(11), 1905–1918. [doi:10.2224/sbp.6751](https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6751)

Ziessler, M., & Nattkemper, D. (2001). Learning of event sequences is based on response-effect learning: Further evidence from a serial reaction task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 27(3), 595-613. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.27.3.595>

Table 1  
Means, Standard Deviations, Correlations, Internal consistencies, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

|   |                              | Mean | SD  | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | CR  | AVE |
|---|------------------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----|-----|
| 1 | T1 Self-efficacy             | 4.29 | .91 | (.83)  | .50*** | .49*** | .37*** | .21*   | .85 | .58 |
| 2 | T2 Self-efficacy             | 4.35 | .94 | .45*** | (.87)  | .74*** | .87*** | .35*** | .87 | .62 |
| 3 | T3 Self-efficacy             | 4.68 | .89 | .44*** | .64*** | (.89)  | .69*** | .46*** | .94 | .66 |
| 4 | T2 Group efficacy beliefs    | 3.61 | .57 | .31*** | .75*** | .49*** | (.88)  | .48*** | .88 | .64 |
| 5 | T2 Shared Transf. Leadership | 4.41 | .73 | .11*   | .21*** | .31*** | .25*** | (.97)  | .97 | .84 |

Note. Individual-level intercorrelations below the main diagonal (N = 456) and group-level intercorrelations above the main diagonal (k = 112). Alpha coefficients on the diagonal.

\*\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05

According to Cohen's (1988) conventions to interpret effect size: A correlation coefficient of .10 is thought to represent a weak or small association; a correlation coefficient of .30 is considered a moderate correlation; and a correlation coefficient of .50 or larger is thought to represent a strong or large correlation.

Table 2

Hierarchical linear models predicting Self-efficacy T3 (level 1 individuals N = 456;  
level 2 groups N = 112)

| Parameters                  | Model 1        | Model 2        |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Fixed effects               |                |                |
| Intercept                   | 4.67*** (0.16) | 4.65*** (0.15) |
| Level 1 (individuals)       |                |                |
| Gender                      | -0.39 (0.07)   | -0.01 (0.07)   |
| Age                         | 0.00 (0.01)    | 0.00 (0.01)    |
| Self-efficacy T1            | 0.17*** (0.04) | 0.19*** (0.04) |
| Self-efficacy T2            | 0.49*** (0.04) | 0.43*** (0.04) |
| Level 2 (groups)            |                |                |
| Group efficacy beliefs T2   |                | 0.20* (0.08)   |
| Shared Trans. Leadership T2 |                | 0.15* (0.06)   |
| Random parameters           |                |                |
| Level 2                     |                |                |
| R <sup>2</sup>              |                | .23            |
| Level 1                     |                |                |
| R <sup>2</sup>              | .78            | .56            |
| -2*log likelihood           | 913.59         | 890.71         |

Note. Standard errors are in parentheses.

\*p < .05. \*\*\*p < .001.




Figure 1. Multilevel Model Results (N= 112 groups at level 2, and N= 456 participants at level 1)

Running head: EFFICACY BELIEFS AND LEADERSHIP

**The Impact of Group Efficacy Beliefs and Transformational Leadership on Followers' Self-  
efficacy: A Multilevel-Longitudinal Study**

Marisa Salanova

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7873-7078>

WANT Research Team. Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Alma M. Rodríguez-Sánchez

IDEA Research Team. Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Karina Nielsen

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9685-9570>

Management School, Sheffield University, UK

Author note

This study was supported by a grant from Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. Gobierno de España (#PSI2015-64933-R) and Universitat Jaume I (UJI-B2017-81).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Professor Marisa Salanova, Department of Social Psychology, Universitat Jaume I, Av. Sos Baynat, s/n. 12071 Castellón (Spain). Tel. +34 964 729583. Fax +34 964 729262. E-mail: [salanova@uji.es](mailto:salanova@uji.es).